

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME XVIII.



COLUMBUS, OHIO :
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1898.

INDEX.

NUMBER 1.

	PAGE
The Doctrine of Infant Salvation a Criterion of Dogmatical Soundness. By Conrad B. Gohdes, A. M.	1
Alumni Address on Education. By Rev. E. G. Tressel, A. M. . . .	21
Some Hindrances in Jewish Missions and How to Remove Them. By Rev. A. R. Kuldell	30
The Origin of Our Date for Christmas. By Rev. Prof. A. Nebe, D. D., Translated by Rev. F. W. Abicht, A. M., Marysville, O. . . .	40
The Origin of the Soul. By Rev. Prof. L. H. Schuh, Ph. D. . . .	47
Biblical Research Notes. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. . . .	56

NUMBER 2.

Of the Two Natures of Christ. By Rev. Prof. A. Pflueger, A. M. . . .	65
Whose Vicar? By Rev. L. H. Burry.	88
The Oneness of Theme and Plan of the Pentateuch. By Rev. G. Finke.	105
City Mission Work. By Rev. J. H. Schneider.	113
Romans 8, 28. By Rev. G. Dillmann, A. M.	118
Biblical Research Notes. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. . . .	122

NUMBER 3.

Liberty and the Reformation. By Rev. Prof. M. Loy, D. D. . . .	129
Missionary Thoughts in the Gospel Lessons of the Church Year. By Rev. J. Sheatsley, S. T. B.	146
The Doctrine of Atonement. By Rev. E. H. D. Winterhoff, A. M. . . .	162
Evangelical Paramentics. By Theodore Schaefer, D. D., Translated from the German by D. M. Martens, D. D.	169
A Mirror for Pastors. Translated from the German of Guthe by Rev. W. E. Tressel.	183
Funeral Sermon.	189

NUMBER 4.

A Plea in Behalf of a Full Service. By Rev. E. G. Tressel, A. M. . . .	193
The Biblical Conception of <i>σάρξ</i> . By Rev. Prof. D. Ahl.	200
A Few Words About the Luther League. By Rev. E. L. S. Tressel, A. M.	210
Faith-cure and Christian Science. By Rev. R. C. H. Lenski, A. M. . . .	214

	PAGE
Christian Symbols in the Catacombs. By Rev. J. C. Schacht...	227
Documents in the Pentateuch. By Rev. G. Finke.....	233
The Minister's Reading. By Rev. Prof. A. Pflueger, A. M.....	236
A Mirror for Pastors. Translated from the German of Guthe by Rev. W. E. Tressel.....	244
Biblical Research Notes. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D....	251

NUMBER 5.

The Leadings of the Spirit. By Rev. Prof. L. H. Schuh, Ph. D.	257
The Targums. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	267
A Mirror for Pastors. Translated from the German of Guthe by Rev. W. E. Tressel.....	274
The Order of Salvation. Translated from the German by Rev. W. M. Kibler.	288
Semi-Centennial of "Inner Mission Work." By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	298
Our Book Concern. By Rev. Prof. M. Loy, D. D.....	303
Notes. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	318

NUMBER 6.

The Bible of the Old and the Bible of the New Theology. By Rev. Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	321
On the Principles of the Cultus.....	327
The Converting Grace of the Holy Spirit and the Transitive Conversion of a Sinner. Translated from Hollazius' Exa- men Part III, Sec. I, Chap. IV, by Rev. Paul S. L. Jano- witz, A. B.....	335
Funeral Sermon. Preached by Rev. E. L. S. Tressel.....	348
Digests from Discussions of Foreign Journals. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	353
A Mirror for Pastors. Translated from the German of Guthe by Rev. W. E. Tressel....	371
Notes. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	383

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XVIII.

FEBRUARY, 1898.

No. 1.

THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT SALVATION A CRITERION OF DOGMATICAL SOUNDNESS.

BY CONRAD B. GOHDES, A. M., NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Church life in every age has had its peculiar dangers. Now it was menaced by the formalist, now by the iconoclast. In one age it was oppressed by the secular usurper, in another hurtful shackles were replaced by still more hurtful license.

A former age was characterized by dogmatical exactness. Doctrine was made the shibboleth of contending hosts. National, racial, hereditary and philosophical principles entered into the interpretation of Scripture, and the result was a divided Protestant Church, each part believing its formularies to be the chosen repository of the whole truth. The present stage of the church's development spells unionism. The very term suggests the welding of a sound idea to an unsound method. While in former ages doctrinal soundness was often emphasized at the expense of soundness of Christian character, the latter is now, with a deplorable disregard of doctrinal views, accepted in many churches as the chief, if not as the only qualification for church membership. The results of this lack of a clear perception of the mutual relations of right belief and right character are clear to the candid observer.

Arminianism, Semipelagianism, gross Pelagianism have crept into the very churches which, for the purpose of exalting the grace of God as the sole source of human

Vol. XVIII--1.

salvation, have denied to the human will even its legitimate place in the process of conversion. Many pulpits are merely platforms for the promulgation of ethics. Charity, holiness, purity are held up as the sweetest fruit and brightest crown of religion—and rightly so,—but the foundation of justification by faith alone through the merits of Christ fails of that recognition in the modern pulpit which its divinely given place in soteriology demands. A hundred times the head of the hydra of unbelief has been severed from its venomous trunk by the sword of truth, but time and again new ones arise and are recognized as modern forms of the old heresies, pantheism, rationalism, pelagianism. A desire to build a common edifice upon a foundation, the strength and nature of which are regarded as immaterial, may well arouse the anxiety of all thoughtful minds. Well it would be, if all the hands, which now labor for the up-building of Zion would unite their energy; but what would the advantage be to the cause of mankind, if the building would collapse at the very time, when its glittering dome touches the heavens, because the builders did not look to the foundation?

The danger threatening our age from growing indifference to doctrinal standards and distinctions is relieved at least by one joyful feature. Whereas the formularies of other churches have lost their hold upon the popular mind, and their differences are interpretatively minimized, the Confessions of our Church have steadily grown in the estimation of their adherents and others. In the last two decades we, in this country, have heard the marching hosts of Lutherans:

“I heard the legions thundering by
And plunged again in thought.”

The divided hosts of our Church have marched to meet not on the field of ecclesiastical controversy but on the field of friendly discussion and association. We have recognized the value of our common heritage, and its common possession promises a common defense and promulgation. The effort of Lutherans, therefore, to establish doctrinal unity as the basis of union may be derided in some quarters as mediævalism, but history will teach its wisdom. A

united Lutheran Church of the future may be destined as the bulwark of truth against the errors hatched in the incubator of present indifference to doctrine.

When books and dissertations are written on the subject of Infant Salvation, the author almost feels an apology to be necessary for once more touching upon a subject apparently exhausted in its various phases and relations. Yet precisely this article deserves to be drawn from the back ground into which it has been relegated by many, because it is one of the criteria of general dogmatical soundness. Both history and logic agree in teaching that all doctrines are interrelated. The leaven of unsound doctrine works slowly but surely. The Church of England, erstwhile noble daughter of the Reformation, has been reduced to pleading—unsuccessfully at that—for the papal recognition of her orders, because, at the incipency of her existence as a separate Protestant body, she failed to purge from her creed the essentially Roman doctrine of the priesthood. In treating of the doctrine of Infant Salvation as taught by the three historic bodies of Christendom, we deal not so much with processes as results, the current teaching being regarded as the position of the church.

The Roman Catholic doctrine of Infant Salvation has been called by Dr. Warfield* the ecclesiastical doctrine. Mistaking her own enslaved communion as the Church of Christ, and believing baptism to be the absolutely sole entrance into the fold, this church rightly makes infant baptism the means of Infant Salvation, but errs in adding the damnatory clause of denying salvation to those whom this sacrament, for whatever cause, fails to reach. The roots of the R. C. doctrine go down into patristic soil. It is clear that the teachers of the church immediately after the epoch of the apostles could not establish a doctrine of Infant Salvation. At least no record of an established consensus of the teachers of that time is extant. Only after the permanence of Christianity was secured against the incessant attacks of Paganism and Judaism by the establish-

* Dr. Warfield has published in recent issues of the *Christian Literature Magazine* a series of articles on the Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation. He has in this article been drawn upon for quotations.

ment of the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, could the teaching of Scripture relative to the application of the merits of Christ to a particular class of men be collated to receive the status of a church doctrine. Long before the period of papal ascendancy, however, the teachers of the church entertained clear views concerning this subject. The existence of race sin was recognized. So was the share borne by the individual at birth in the universal apostasy by reason of original sin. The universality of the atonement was also seen and taught as a comforting reality. And to complete the system, the means of grace were recognized as the connecting link between the need of the sinner and the divine grace. At the time of Tertullian and Cyprian there can be said to have been a consensus of teachers relative to the doctrine of Infant Salvation, as the extant patristic writings clearly show. It was the regeneration to God of the infant by Holy Baptism. Lutherans shake hands across the chasm of time with their patristic forerunners in holding that the new birth, of which Christ speaks in the third chapter of John, is linked to baptism as its channel.

However the patristic conception of infant baptism gradually accreted to itself elements of weakness. Partly from a desire to exalt the blessed sacrament, partly from a natural impulse to round out their doctrine, the Fathers made deductions from their premises which the Word of God did not warrant. What God had established as an ordinary channel of grace, they changed into an absolute, iron-clad rule. Under the impression of fortifying their arguments into impregnability, they opened breaches to the opponent by teaching the condemnation of infants to whom the sacrament had not been applied. Notably Gregory the Great and Augustine are responsible for dimming the glory of the patristic age by foisting upon the church a belief in a hell peopled with infants. However, three great truths later ages have inherited from the patristic age: Infants need salvation because they share in the sin of the race and are by nature incapacitated for the enjoyment of heaven; infants in common with other men, can be saved alone by the work of Christ; the blessings of this work are conveyed to infants by baptism as the only means accessible to them.

The Church of Rome, into which the early church gradually degenerated, could not well improve upon these principles. With characteristic viciousness she manipulated them for weaving the woof and warp of her fantastic ecclesiasticism. Well may the Church of Rome pride herself upon the completeness of her system. She is nothing if not logical. "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus," is her major premise. Baptism is the door to the church, is the minor premise. Therefore there is no salvation for those who have failed to receive the holy sacrament is the conclusion. While so far the church had not formulated a doctrine binding upon the consciences of her members and merely the utterances of prominent teachers can be cited as indicating the drift of development, nascent Romanism heralded its advent by official utterances for the guidance of the faithful. Already the second Council of Lyons and that of Florence declare that "the souls of those who pass away in mortal sin or in original sin alone descend immediately to hell, to be punished, however with unequal penalties." About the year twelve hundred Pope Innocent II specified the difference between lost infants and lost adults. The penalty of original sin he affirms to be the lack of the vision of God, but the penalty of actual sin eternal torments. Still, as "gradus non mutant speciem" unbaptized infants are lost to the kingdom of God as well as adults dying in mortal sin, according to the Church of Rome. This doctrine is still posited by the acknowledged formularies and teachers of the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent makes it an article of faith that infants dying unbaptized incur damnation. The catechism prepared and enjoined by the third Plenary Council of Baltimore teaches that baptism is "necessary to salvation, because without it we can not enter the kingdom of heaven." It can not escape the attention of an observant evangelical Christian that the Romish Church has a special predilection for negations. Instead of confining her postulate to the saving effect of baptism, as the Lutheran Church does, she emphasizes the damning effect of the failure of its application upon the very ones who can possibly incur no responsibility for such failure. Instead of merely laying down the divinely established rule and leaving room for exceptions, she presumptuously makes the rule for men

coterminous with divine mercy. Rev. Wm. Byrne, quoted by Dr. Warfield, may be considered as positing the authentic teaching of the Church of Rome when he says in his "Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals": "Baptism is necessary as a means of salvation for both infants and adults. This necessity is not such as to exclude exceptions as regards the rite, though not as regards the substance and chief effects, in case actual baptism is impossible. In the case of adults the effect can be obtained by contrition, perfect love of God (sic!), with a desire for baptism. In the case of infants who are dead in sin through sharing in the guilt of Adam, and are incapable of making an act of attrition, the only way they can enter the kingdom of heaven is baptism."

While neither the doctrine nor the practice of Rome bear the characteristics of mercy in an eminent degree, the nature of Romanists is still human. The inevitable revulsion of sentiment from the damnatory clause of infant salvation has found expression in the mitigation theories of Catholic scholars, which in turn have been accepted by many of her people and won toleration from her rulers. Already in the patristic age the baptism of blood or martyrdom was accepted as embodying the blessings ordinarily conveyed by baptism. Early in the history of the Roman Church there was taught a baptism of intention. Rome on the height of temporal power was fond of indulging in pleasantries with her royal subjects who had failed to yield proper obedience to the dictates of their mistress. Issuing interdicts as favorite method of persuasion, she, according to her own creed, made salvation impossible for thousands of her lambs by depriving them of baptism. To comfort the fathers and mothers weeping over unblessed graves, Hincmar of Rheims, more human than his creed, taught that the intention of the parents would be received in lieu of the performance of the rite itself. A further mitigation of the damnatory clause consisted in the scholastic distinction between the "poena damni" and the "poena sensus." The poena damni with strange etymological inconsistency was held to mean a mere loss of the beatific vision of God and to await infants who should die unbaptized, whereas the poena sensus or torment would be the penalty of any one dying in mortal sin. Along this line scholastic thought de-

veloped into the doctrine of the limbus infantum situated according to Dante "where the first circle girds the abyss of dread." Though in hell, the infants who have died outside the visible pale of the church "enjoy a happiness transcending," to speak with a Catholic theologian, "our most vivid anticipations." It is known that the same church, tying her own children remorselessly to her ordinances, gives the hope of a mere "poena damni" to sectaries and heathen who, in "invincible ignorance," have in sincerity lived outside the visible fold of Christ. For such Roman scholastics bespeak, likewise "a real and true happiness in hell, whereby man's natural capacity for happiness is gratified to the utmost." Thus Rome gives us in the vaporings of her scholastics not an illustration of being "semper eadem," for which the world is yearning, but of gross rationalism, inconsistency, ecclesiasticism and pelagianism. Canonizing Augustine and anathematizing Pelagius, Rome, in the sweep of her destiny, also in this respect repudiates the former and follows the latter. Pelagius, denying original sin, found no difficulty in predicating of children dying without having had an opportunity to battle for the crown, a condition, hereafter, of natural felicity. And Rome admitting the existence and damnability of original sin, after wading through the tortuous channel of scholastic speculation, makes a compromise between papal fiat and human nature and clasps hands with Pelagius.

The Reformed teaching of Infant Salvation can be called the predestinarian doctrine, inasmuch as it suspends the salvation, as that of all other persons, alone upon the free election of God. Human nature has done not a little in molding this doctrine to its present form of inclusiveness.

While at first the utmost caution was maintained in affirming salvation of any child unless it was a member of the covenant, the present consensus of the churches of this type is in favor of affirming the salvation of all children, irrespective of ancestry and the application of the means of grace.

Predestination is the centre of gravity in the whole theological system of the Reformed churches, hence it is not to be wondered at that the desire to teach the general salvation of infants has drawn this central doctrine into re-

quisition. The Symbol of the Presbyterian Church, the Westminster Confession, expresses this postulate of Calvinism most strongly in the declaration: "All those whom God has predestinated unto life, and those only, He is pleased, in His appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by His Word and Spirit."

Reformed theology, it appears, does not hesitate to include the children of believers in the number of the elect, but the manner of fortifying its position is typically Reformed and unscriptural. "Whereas in adults faith and the fruits of the same are considered as sure signs of election, in infants birth within the bounds of the covenant, is held to be a sure sign of election, since the promise is unto us and unto our children." (Warfield.) Thus consanguinity is made the means of adoption into the covenant of God instead of the means of grace, baptism. Forgetful that the Hebrew derivation has given the term "children" a broader meaning, according to which rather descendants in general are meant than infants, the Reformed churches make the natural birth from Christian parents the door of the covenant which is to be followed by baptism as the visible sign. Professor Warfield avers that the distinguishing doctrines of the Reformed churches by suspending salvation upon membership in the invisible rather than visible church, transforms baptism from a necessity into a duty and leaves men dependent for salvation alone upon the infinite love and free grace of God." John Gerhard, true to his Reformed bias predicates of a Christian relationship what he denies of the divinely appointed means of grace. According to him "the infants of believers all alike, whether baptized or unbaptized, are rightly holy from their mothers' womb by the inheritance of the promise, and enjoy eternal salvation in the covenant and company of God." This view of the modern theologian is not a private opinion but has been raised to the dignity of a church doctrine by the Synod of Dort, which declares: "Since we are to judge of the will of God according to the Word which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not by nature, but in virtue of the covenant of grace, in which they together with their parents are comprehended, godly parents have no reason to doubt of the election of their children whom it pleases God to call out of

this life in their infancy." When we add to this statement the doctrine of the Westminster Confession concerning Infant Salvation, we are able to form a correct opinion relative to the Reformed position. It says: "Elect infants dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved in Christ, through the Spirit who worketh when and where He pleaseth."

The weakness of this position is manifest. A power of transmitting grace is assigned to Christian parentage nowhere ascribed to it in Scripture and in clashing with the generally correct Reformed doctrine of original sin. "Whatsoever is born of the flesh is flesh" is the teaching of the Scripture. The birth from the mother's womb is not accompanied by the spiritual birth, but is, of necessity, to be followed by the second birth to qualify the child for the kingdom of heaven. It is incomprehensible why Reformed theology should with such persistency deny efficacy to the Holy Sacraments and, practically, attribute grace to heredity. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He hath saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Thus the false doctrine of the Reformed churches in regard to the means of grace, is clearly exemplified by their mode of setting forth the salvation of infants. Moreover their position is devoid of comfort for their arguments become contradictory to each other according to the several purposes for which they are employed. Witness the following defense of a weak point in the Westminster Confession: "In the Presbyterian Pastor's Catechism, published by the Rev. John H. Bockock upon the authority of the Presbyterian Board, we find the following questions and answers: Q. Why do we not baptize the children of unbelievers? A. Not because we think that such children would be lost if they died in infancy. We do not think that children would be lost, if they died in infancy. We do not think that children are saved on account of their baptism, but through the merits of Christ. Baptism does not confer salvation but only acknowledges and recognizes it. Non-elect are not such as die in infancy, but grow up to be wicked and impenitent men, such as Cain," etc. By seeking to guard against the inference that according to the Presbyterian faith any infant dying in infancy might be lost, a fatal weak-

ness of the Reformed system is exposed. The affirmation that a child growing up into enmity to Christ manifests by that its exclusion from the number of the elect, deals the death blow to the characteristically Reformed postulate that descent from Christian parents finds a concomitant in membership in the divine covenant. For it is a fact, the mere statement of which is a sufficient establishment of its truth that some children of Christian parents do grow up to be wicked men. Hence in spite of their membership in a Christian family they fail of membership in the covenant. What now becomes of the statement of the Synod of Dort (Chap. I, Art. 17): "Since we are to judge of the will of God according to His Word, which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not by nature but by the covenant of grace, in which they together with their parents are comprehended, godly parents have no reason to doubt of the election and salvation of their children whom it pleaseth God to call out of this life in their infancy." What becomes of the assertion of John Gerhard that "the infants of believers all alike, whether baptized and unbaptized are holy from their mother's womb by the inheritance of the promise?" Children of Christian parents often live and die as enemies of Christ. If this were not the case no general apostasy would ever have been possible. This fact, according to the authorized apology of the Westminster Confession (Presb. Pastor's Cat.) is evidence that they do not belong to the elect, for otherwise they would have died in infancy. Not belonging to the elect they were not holy from their mother's womb, nor did they belong to the covenant of God. Thus Reformed theology entangles itself in the meshes of its own contradictions, because it lets membership in a Christian family eo ipso be accompanied by saving grace, instead of insisting upon the application of the merits of Christ to the child through means appointed for that purpose. Reformed theology looks upon the sacrament of baptism principally as a human duty instead of a divine ordinance; not as a starting point of individual Christian life but as a seal following it. Thus Reformed theology furnishes the confutation of its own premises.

Though the mercy of God undoubtedly has scattered sunbeams of light even upon the hillocks of unbaptized chil-

children, yet along this line of reasoning they can not be seen. If only one child of Christian parents has ever become a reprobate, the ground is taken from the Reformed doctrine of Infant Salvation. Nevertheless along these lines the Reformed doctrine of Infant Salvation has developed. Free election is said to seize upon the children of Christian believers with the addition of such others, as the divine grace may choose from without the covenant. This historical attitude of Calvinism is well expressed by Jonathan Dickinson, an American theologian of the seventeenth century. He says in his book, *The True Scripture Doctrine concerning some Important Points of the Christian Faith*: "We have indeed the highest encouragement to dedicate our children to Christ, since He hath told us: 'of such is the kingdom of heaven'; and the strongest reason to hope as to the happiness of those deceased infants who have thus been dedicated to Him. But God hath not been pleased to reveal to us, how far He will extend His uncovenanted mercy to those who die in infancy. As on the one hand I do not know that the Scripture anywhere assures us that they shall all be saved, so, on the other hand, we have not, that I know of, any evidence from Scripture or the nature of things, that any of them will eternally perish. All they who die in infancy may — for aught we know — belong to the election of grace; and be predestinated to the adoption of children. They may in methods unknown to us have the benefits of Christ's redemption applied to them; and thereby be made heirs to eternal glory. They are naturally under the guilt and pollution of original sin; but they may notwithstanding this, for anything that appears to the contrary, be renewed by the gracious influences of the Spirit of God, and thereby be made meet for eternal life. It, therefore, concerns us, without any bold and presumptuous conclusions to leave them in the hands of that God whose tender mercies are over all His works." This caution, however, not to put the deductions of the Christian consciousness upon the same level with what has been clearly revealed, has ceased to be the attitude of Reformed theology in the course of time. And naturally. For giving to Christian ancestry the place which belongs, in the economy of grace, to the means of grace, even this slight avenue of grace was finally discarded

as superfluous. Professor Warfield states the present consensus of the Reformed churches to be this: "All who die in infancy are the children of God and enter at once into His glory — not because original sin alone is not deserving of eternal punishment (for all are children of wrath), nor because those that die in infancy are less deserving than others (for relative innocence would merit only relatively light punishment, not freedom from all punishment), nor because they die in infancy, (for that they die in infancy is not the cause but the effect of God's mercy toward them), but simply because God in His infinite love has chosen them in Christ, before the foundation of the world, by a loving fore-ordination of them unto adoption as sons in Jesus Christ."

Here we find the doctrine of the universal salvation of infants posited with the same unhesitating certainty at the end of the nineteenth century as had been done by Zwingli in the middle of the sixteenth. Its development in this Church is analogous to that in the Church of Rome. As Rome practically adopted the conclusions of Pelagius in forecasting the future of unbaptized children, though radically at variance with his views concerning original sin, so the Reformed churches have adopted the views of Zwingli relative to Infant Salvation though repudiating in their Confessions his lax notions about original sin.

It is clear that the primary purpose to teach dogmatically the universal salvation of children has taken not inconsiderable liberties with the postulates of the Reformed churches. In the first place is the idea of predestination completely traversed when the election of grace is ascribed to all children alike, without regard to ancestry, environment, or application of the means of grace. The Reformed theology places the subjects of election among the unfathomable mysteries of God, yet here a whole class of human beings, by far the greatest numerically, is held to belong to the number of the elect. This tenet is maintained in the face of an absolute failure on the part of Scripture to link infancy through death with the elective decree. Then the application of the merits of Christ to this specific class through a method of general binding forces is deemed en-

tirely unnecessary in the Reformed conception of the economy of grace.

The teaching of the Lutheran Church that baptism is a channel of grace particularly for infants, is spurned by the Reformed churches as a remnant of popery; yet they positively assert the regeneration of a vast class of human beings without a known avenue of grace. Repudiating the avenue designated in Scripture, they insist upon the existence of one not revealed. So convinced are they that "the Spirit of God worketh when and where He pleaseth", that they deny His power and purpose to regenerate through a divinely appointed ordinance. And when we come to analyze the *modus operandi* whereby their Christian consciousness has assured itself of the universal salvation of children, we find that they have poured their wine into very old and leaky vessels. The Reformed system makes absolute predestination the final cause of the individual's destiny. His attitude toward the Redemption of Christ is not the cause of election but its effect. The Christian consciousness of our Reformed brethren would not permit them to stop short of a positive postulation of the election of all children, but does not hesitate to make the same final cause determinative of the eternal woe of millions of others. Is it really a more horrible doctrine to deny salvation to infants dying in infancy with the proviso that their eternal lot will be commensurate with the degree of their culpability, than to teach a human destiny which commences with an unhallowed infancy, merges into an age cursed by unbelief and ends with an eternal doom, and all this the result of an eternal decree according to the good pleasure of a sovereign God? Truly it is not to be wondered at that Robert Ingersoll, the scion of Presbyterian ancestry, was driven into the opposite extreme of agnosticism by such a presentation of the divine sovereignty.

In short, the doctrine of Infant Salvation, as held in the Reformed churches, is indicative of the fundamental errors of Calvinism, Predestinarianism, Rationalism, and disregard of divine order in the economy of grace and the operations of the Holy Spirit.

The Lutheran doctrine of Infant Salvation can well be called the evangelical doctrine, because its constitutive prin-

ciple is the collation of the merits of Christ through the sacrament. As the genius of the Reformed Church derives its life and tendency from its predestinarianism, so the genius of the Lutheran Church derived its trend from the Scriptural doctrine of the means of grace. Thus the respective conception of the sacraments in regard to Infant Salvation shows the radical difference between the two systems.

According to the Reformed Church the sacraments are mere signs. Calvin may define the sacrament as more than a mere "signum", as a "sigillum" and even as "pignus", but though his expressions adumbrate Lutheran phraseology, he does not fail to distinguish between the "signum" and the "res signata", absolutely denying that the former is the vehicle of the latter. As the theology of the Reformed Church degrades even the Word from a means of regeneration to an occasion of regeneration, so the visible Word, the sacrament, is failed to be recognized as an actual channel of grace. Calvinism places such a strong emphasis upon the subjective experience of the blessing which the means of grace communicate that the objective value of the latter is overlooked.

The child according to Reformed reasoning being unable by conscious reflection to appropriate the blessings of Christ, the sacrament can, at the most, be a sign, a pledge and prophecy of a future subjective experience and possession. This conception, shadowy as it is, is robbed of much of its remaining value by the predestinarian taint which informs the whole of Reformed theology. Whatever blessing the sacrament may represent, it can only be a hollow mockery, a ray of light irradiating not a future boon, but a sad "it might have been" for any one who fails to belong to the number of the elect. The Reformed mother may be certain of her dead infant having inherited the mansions of the blessed, — a certainty of which we shall not deprive her, imperfectly though the predestinarian theory can substantiate its proposition —; what guaranty can she have of God having included the living child in His eternal purpose of salvation? None. There may be spots upon the chief orb of our solar system, as astronomers assure us, but Calvinistic predestinarianism has invested the very Sun of Righteousness with spots. The failure of the Reformed Church.

to recognize the objective nature of the sacrament is thus seen to render the subjective experience deceptive. The visions of some spiritualists are undoubtedly subjective phenomena, but the failure to interpret these experiences in the light of objective facts, the self-made interpretations and deductions of these people become a misleading *ignis fatuus*. Even so it is in religion, when objective truth is not made the test and guide of subjective experience.

The Lutheran doctrine of Infant Salvation is suggested chiefly by the condition of the infant and the nature of the sacrament. To us of the Church of the Reformation baptism is not a mere sign, but a water connected with God's Word and comprehended in God's command. The sacramental Word appeals not only to the sense of hearing, but to sight and touch as well. Being the visible Word it is accompanied by the Holy Spirit who accompanies the Word not occasionally, but operates through it as the vehicle of communicating with the spirit of man. Being a physical-spiritual organism the means of communication which God uses in dealing with His creature must be of a character to meet this condition. Both the Word and the sacraments are primarily an appeal to the senses; through these, unless resisted, entrance is secured for the Holy Spirit into the soul, for which the body is at the same time a wall and an avenue. The coming of the Spirit through the Word, it may be the audible or the sacramental Word, which is the Word plus its seal, involves the gracious approach of the Holy Trinity, for the Holy Trinity is indivisible. That means that in the sacrament of baptism Christ comes with the blessings purchased on Calvary, namely His righteousness and saving merits. Thus baptism becomes more than a "signum" or even "sigillum", it becomes "a burial into the death of Christ", a "putting on of Christ." The indwelling of the Godhead in the sacrament is indeed a mystery transcending by far any and all unions that can be analyzed by the human intellect, but it is real though the eyes of faith behold it and not those of reason. The sacramental Word diffuses the same blessings, has the same efficiency as the audible Word. The Holy Spirit through it applies the merits of Christ and by creating faith in the heart of the individual works the new life, which is the subjective condition for the realization of

the objective blessing. The sacrament is the Word concentrated upon the individual, its powers being focussed upon the sinner's heart. In it the Lord progresses from the general "you" to the individualizing "thou", giving the chief of sinners, as which every convicted sinner will own himself, the guaranty that he also is included in the general amnesty declared by the Gospel.

Keeping in mind the collative power of the sacrament, its availability for infants commends itself to the faith and judgment of the Christian. God in His love has embraced the whole human race in Jesus Christ. We may put it stronger and say that God, potentially, has elected the whole human race in Jesus Christ. As His love so His commission to declare His love, embraces all men, none excluded. But as the Redemption crystallizes into the salvation of the individual only when the latter has been enabled to embrace the Savior in faith, such personal contact is to be brought about between the Savior and the redeemed child. That corollary of the Gospel: "Without faith it is impossible to please God" is as absolute as the impossibility of salvation apart from Jesus Christ. Owing to the condition of the child the Word can not be used as the connecting link between itself and the Savior. The infant is incapable of the powers of conscious volition. They are as yet dormant. However their use is the only adequate response to the Word and the inalienable condition of its efficiency. Baptism on the other hand so fully meets the wants and conditions of infants as to become the "circumcision made without hands", and like its Old Testament prototype, the very sacrament for infants. The only impediment which can neutralize the efficacy of the sacrament is wilful resistance. This the Word is calculated to remove in adults who alone can exercise it. Therefore the Word is propædæutic and didactic before it is creative. These last mentioned properties the sacrament does not possess, nor are they necessary. For to impute to the child wilful resistance to the grace offered would imply a predication to the infant of conscious reflection and volition. In this manner baptism becomes for the infant at the same time an instrument of objective grace and subjective regeneration. It is an illustration of the biblical conception of true growth; first the germ, then the blade, then the

fruit. That faith should be at its very incipency a full-grown and conscious condition, seems most unreasonable. Even in Paul and the Pentecostal converts it consisted not so much in an instantaneous creation as in the adjustment of truth long known to its living embodiment then first revealed in all its grandeur. In baptism faith is laid in the child's heart, which though germinal is actual because capable of indefinite enlargement and development. This faith is not reflective in self-consciousness, but apprehensive in reaching out toward saving grace. Its reality can no more be doubted than the heirship of the infant prince, which though in the cradle, is the heir to a throne.

Even in the absence of conscious reflection God is able to bring into the subconscious possession of the child the blessings contained and conveyed in the sacrament. Should not the vague and instinctive desire of the infant for its mother be analogous to the germinal spiritual life of the tiny member of the covenant?

The Reformed churches denying the collative power of the sacrament, by reason of the absence of a conscious response to it on the part of the infant recipient, overrate the importance of self-consciousness without warrant from Scripture and the nature of things. Adults are unconscious during sleep of their covenant blessings; the same is true of Christians mentally deranged, yet faith exists notwithstanding, as there is no need of begetting it anew when the temporary obstruction has been removed. Even in the adult faith must be created before he can consciously exercise it, though in this case the succession of cause and effect is so immediate as to be capable only of technical, not chronical determination.

Such, briefly described, is the Lutheran system of Infant Salvation. Unlike the Reformed Church it makes the link between the atonement of Christ and the individual not a predestination, which at the same time contracts the atonement of Christ and makes its beneficiaries objects of uncertainty; but rather the means of grace appointed by God and known both as to the subjects within their scope, and their power. The Lutheran mother can know beyond a doubt that her baptized child has been brought into cove-

nant relation with God, while the Reformed mother, from her own standpoint, can be certain only of the election of those children which have departed in infancy. But the objection may be raised: Since faith is often lost when years of self-determination are reached, is not the uncertainty as great on one side as on the other? Positively no. According to the Reformed system the uncertainty is as to the divine intent or failure to elect, on our side no uncertainty is entertained as to the will of God, that being declared as a gracious will toward all alike, in the Gospel generally, in the Sacrament individually. The uncertainty is merely as to man's willingness to abide in the estate conferred and sealed in the baptismal act. According to the Calvinistic system the non-elect is the reprobate, according to the evangelical system the reprobate is the non-elect.

Baptism is accessible to all children as far as the banners of salvation float, therefore the Scriptures by instituting baptism as the means of incorporating children into the kingdom of God have given us a source of unspeakable comfort. That the administration of the ordinance is necessary to the realization of this comfort, is self-evident. This is taught by Christ and the formularies of our Church. As could be expected, the evangelical mode of setting forth the salvation of infants has drawn upon itself the opposition of the sects, which usually takes the form of unjust imputation. Teaching the necessity of baptism in order to participate in the blessings of Christ, the implication is made by opponents that we, with the Church of Rome, teach the damnation of unbaptized infants. That a mode of the salvation of unbaptized infants is not an integral part of our Confessions is true. This, however, is to the credit of the Church. The object of a Confession is to present, in logical order, the system of salvation, as taught in the Scriptures. A Confession is to be not the voice of speculation, or philosophy, or metaphysics, but of Scripture! Hence no Confession can legitimately set forth a doctrine upon a point, on which the Bible observes silence. Our feeble human reason can not without tremendous grappling grasp the truth which has been revealed — and then only under the guidance of the Holy Spirit —; we should fear to pronounce upon things, upon which the Word has thrown no light. The mode, not

even the fact of the salvation of those who have not received the means of grace has not been revealed in the Holy Scriptures, hence no Symbol should form a doctrine upon these points at the risk of teaching illusions which may be dispelled by future research. Make the salvation of infants without the means of grace your creed and indifference to baptism will inevitably follow, just as indifference to the work of mission will result from a refusal to teach and believe the lost condition of the heathen without Christ.

Still, the Lutheran Church has never followed in the footsteps of Rome by teaching the damnation of any infant whatever. The farthest that her teachers have gone is to assume an agnostic position in regard to children outside the covenant. Gerhard, than whom no teacher in our Church has a better reputation for conservatism, writes: "We distinguish between a necessity on our part and on God's part; between the case of privation and the ordinary way; and also between children born in the Church and those outside. Concerning those born out of the Church we say with the apostle (1 Cor. 5, 12 and 13), 'What have I to do with judging them that are without? Do not you judge them that are within? For them that are without God judgeth.' Wherefore, since there is no promise concerning them, we commit them to God's judgment, and yet we hold to no place intermediate between heaven and hell, concerning which there is utter silence in Scriptures." Thus Gerhard on the children of heathen. Similarly our fathers have ever taught, as Dr. Krauth has abundantly shown in his book: the Conservative Reformation, that the contempt, not the privation of the sacrament condemns. Though the Lutheran Church insists strenuously upon the use of the ordinary means of grace, there is no teacher living, who will affirm the damnation of a single infant soul. Christian conscience, however strictly we demand its fealty to the revealed Word, will not permit us to believe that the Father of all mercy will condemn a child which has never wilfully resisted His grace.

Still Professor Warfield, a protagonist of Calvinism in the Presbyterian Church, asserts that this voice of uncovenanted hope is in conflict with the statements of our Confessions. "Should this hope prove true", he says, "it would

no longer be true, that baptism is necessary to salvation, even ordinarily; the exception would be the rule, nor would the fundamental conception of the Lutheran theory of salvation — that grace is in the means of grace — be longer tenable. The logic of the Lutheran system leaves little room for the salvation of unbaptized infants dying in infancy, and if their salvation should prove a fact, the integrity of the system would be endangered."

A Lutheran answer is this: If God chooses to save all unbaptized infants, He merely manifests His pleasure to depart from rules He has given us. The means of grace are the arms with which the Church, and through her the Holy Spirit, draws souls into the fold of Christ. Should God lead the throngs of infants dying without the Church into His kingdom, it is God who makes this addition to the saved, in a manner known to Himself, not to the Church which knows of no means of grace but the appointed ones. Therefore for the Christian Church baptism is the ordinary method of leading infants to Christ. Of saving influences outside her pale, we have absolutely no knowledge whatever. That the means of grace are shown to be devoid of grace, just because God chooses to bestow grace in a manner unknown to us, a scholar like Dr. Warfield will, upon further reflection, barely maintain.

It has been shown then conclusively that our system of Infant Salvation may be rightly called the evangelical system. We take our children to the baptismal Word as the avenue to the bourne which alone cleanses the soul from the innate leprosy of sin. The bourne is the Redeemer's blood. On the other hand we do not deny that the All-merciful One has found a way of leading the countless myriads of infants dying in their infancy, and which He does not reach through the means entrusted to the Church, to the same healing bourne. The curse of sin, both original and actual, the necessity of regeneration for all alike, conscientious application of the means of grace, hesitancy to tread where revelation has not shown the way, these and similar features of our system of Infant Salvation evidence the ability of the Church of the Reformation to stand this test of dogmatical soundness.

ALUMNI ADDRESS ON EDUCATION.*

BY REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Not by nature, not by grace,
Am I fit to take the place
Of a teacher to our race.
But my task is quicker done;
What we want's a little fun
For ourselves and any one.
Graduates are "leveled up,"
And they fill a larger cup
Than others. Deeper do they sup
Of wisdom, and lead the strife
In thought and act in this life;
With all great things are they rife.

Thus many claim, and many concede the claim. Schools are increasing in number, in courses, in equipments, in promises, and, it is claimed, in fulfillment. It is to be taken for granted that college men, those who teach in the colleges, and those who finish the courses and go out from them, will be the very best men for the welfare and general uplifting of the country. They are men who are themselves qualified for the positions of influence and power, and should soon find the places for which they are suited. Granted that these things should be so, it may still be profitable to tarry a moment with the question and ask, "Do the Educated Educate?" as applied in the general and comprehensive sense, and as applied to us who this day gather as an association of educated men.

A great educator defines the objects of education under the two heads:

First.—Education may be regarded as having for its object the development of the powers of the student without any reference whatever to any use which he is to make of those powers in the business of life.

* Published by request of Alumni.

Second.—Education may be viewed solely as a training by which the student may be enabled to carry on some line of work, whether that be professional, artistic, mechanical or otherwise useful to himself and his fellow men. *Cosmopolitan*, June, 1897, p. 189.

These are definitions in a series of articles professedly prepared for the purpose of showing what true and liberal education implies and requires. It seems to us that these definitions are too wide and too narrow. The first is too wide because it looks only to the development of powers in man without any care as to what he is and is to be among men. The second is too narrow because it forgets that man's limitations must be controlled by the things outside his chosen sphere as well as by the things within. The whole view limits education to a certain line of information, commonly called education, without a comprehensive view of man as a social being who is to be a part of a community and is to act his part in the life of a nation, in a wider or narrower sphere, in accordance with the powers, abilities and opportunities given him. How often is education looked upon as the acquisition of certain knowledge, limited to very narrow bounds, without ever a hint toward the emotions and powers surging around in breast and brain, and which need, during that time, to be cared for as much as the other things! What is true education? A definition found in the "Standard" is more satisfactory:

"The systematic development and cultivation of the mind and other natural powers, and the direction of the feelings, the tastes and the manners by inculcation, example, experience and impression." If to this were added the fact that true education implies also a giving to man knowledge he cannot and does not obtain by the exercise of any natural gifts, and a cultivation of himself with all natural powers in accord with this superior knowledge and direction, the definition would be complete.

But we must particularize. We have several fields of learning in accordance with the work to be done: the ministry, teaching, law, medicine, arts and sciences, with all the many fields for practical mechanical and farm labor. There is a fundamental education necessary for all of these. It

is the acquisition of those things necessary to the prosecution of special study for life's calling. The basis is the languages in general, and the structure of the ones to be used in after life in particular, with the drill in numbers and mind and its laws requisite to do two things; to develop and discipline the powers and to educate and form the judgment. It is not absolutely essential that each branch studied be required in life's after work. Youth needs discipline, and the mind training; if the studies that will serve the individual in after life will do this, let them be pursued, but if not, then let the course be followed that will do it. This is the formative period. If the literary and moral judgment can be properly formed, students will be ready to pursue the study of medicine, law, the arts and the sciences in special schools without much danger of being led astray by worldly tendencies. Those who study for the ministry remain with us and are to receive full and final training from us. There are two things which we wish to emphasize in regard to them. The one we call the elocutionary education. Listen to a plea that is as unselfish as it is earnest and essential. First let us clear away a few misapprehensions and sophisms. We all recognize that the power of conversation and purity of life rests in the Word of God by the presence of the Holy Spirit. It is God who works in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure. The work of salvation is wholly of God. When we have done all we can, we must confess we are unprofitable servants. Therefore some conclude that the meaner the earthly vessel the more powerful the heavenly. Therefore, they would reason, it is unbecoming a servant of God to cultivate the habit and power of good delivery. But it does not hold good in regard to the correct use of words and language. As well might a man argue that correct grammar and rhetoric interfere with the power of the Word, as to say that the cultivation of a good voice and correct delivery necessarily detract from the grace of the spoken Word. Again it is argued that such cultivation makes man artificial and unfit to present truth plainly and simply. Have you never seen the preacher who was unable, after four and more years of Latin and Greek, to discuss a doctrine upon the basis of the original Greek in

Scripture? Have you not heard of such deficient scholars parading their supposed learning before audiences where their lack of knowledge was not likely to be detected? On the basis of such facts should we not condemn the study of those noble languages? No, we cry out; give more of them, that the one may go to the fountain of divine truth and drink it in deeply, and the other will use knowledge for its proper purpose, not to exploit its possession, but to be a power for good among men. What is meant by an elocutionary training? Let us see what it ought to do. We are told in psychology that its study is important, "because, 1, It serves to develop and strengthen the powers of the mind; 2, It reveals to us the mysteries of our own nature, and is thus an aid to self-control, a guide to the knowledge of man, and a help to the appreciation of literature; 3, It furnishes the foundation for the philosophical sciences of logic, esthetics, ethics and metaphysics; and 4, It leads a devout mind to a wider and more intelligent admiration of the wonderful works of God." That proves its importance. What can the proper study of elocution and oratory do? 1, It is better for the development and preservation of the physical powers than any course of purely physical training, and than all the games of ball and tennis ever known. It develops and exercises those muscles and powers which produce vitality as well as those which consume vitality. It energizes while it exhausts, and has no record of broken hopes and blasted constitutions as is found in the history of athletics and physical culture; 2, It enables man to understand and properly to use the voice, the most glorious and marvelous of the gifts of God to man's bodily powers; 3, It enables man to do more and suffer less with his physical powers than by any other education; 4, It opens man to impression that he may much better give expression; 5, It opens to him the passions and powers of the human heart, and enables him to understand literature far better than before; 6, It gives him mastery over himself and a key to the hearts and feelings of others; 7, It is a wonderful stimulus to the study of man and of God, that the most may be made of man's gifts and powers for the glory of that God who has so fearfully and wonderfully made us. In short

it shows a man how to make the most of his gifts and powers with the least wear on himself and to the best advantage in every way; above all to be a better servant in the hands of the Lord.

The other we denominate the family idea. This fails of its proper place for two reasons. The one is the neglect of the proper cultivation of the social habit, and the other is the proper instruction in regard to the place the young man has to fill in the family. Of all men the graduate, and especially the minister, ought to know people, and to be at home in and with the family. The family is the seat of much of the work and hope of the church. If the family is what it ought to be, we can depend on the safety of the church and state. In the family all ages and both sexes are found. Can a person be said to be educated who has no proper conception of the family relation, and cannot by association in it adapt himself to the condition of the people with whom he must minister? Association and direction will do much for young men. Numbers partially fail in life because they are apart from the family in their educational course and then go out with misconceptions of the family relation and requirements; and instead of suiting themselves to men they carry out their own false notions. Some call it boorishness, others a lack of sense, while often it is a failure in the education. It is often the want of right direction and association in the formative period of their educational course. To this can be added the more serious fact that generally the graduate is sent out into his calling with the age and other conditions, except money, that moves him to establish a home of his own. No direction whatever has been given him, in his education, in regard to a companion for life. What he should be in such a relation, and what should be the requirements on the side of the partner, and how to find the requirements, have never been imparted.

The regulations of college may prohibit certain things in regard to the future companion, but the curriculum does not supply the antidote, nor do the members of the faculty or the members of the profession in any proper way instruct in this all-important question. How to solve an equation, to unravel a syllogism, to read Virgil and Homer are mo-

mentous and great questions; and the institution would be disgraced that would send forth its men without the knowledge. But to impart the knowledge of the head and heart and character that a young man should link himself with for life, that is not a part of education and an indelible work of disgrace would be stamped upon the institution presuming to tell a young man what to do for a wife. It may be answered that a housefather has a call to do this, if it is to be done at all; and if neglected on his part, the institution is not to be blamed. Who will concede that anything ought to be said or done on the matter? A word here and there, and proper direction on the part of the rightful authorities may be of untold value to young men. What might be done and is not, in our schools on both these questions, only the good God knows; but I submit the matter and hope it will receive the attention it deserves. Is that man educated who has no information given him on these vital questions?

The question goes further and deeper. One-half our youth are not covered by these remarks. It is an honor that a family has many in it, and that some are of the same sex as our mothers. "Children are a heritage of the Lord. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them." Ps. 127, 3-5. A girl is just as precious a gift as a boy; and a young lady is just as interesting as a young man. Her education is as important and binding upon parents. In some respects it is more important. If education ought to be begun in the grandparents, and the saying is forcible, the grandmother should not be neglected; and the way to have a good grandmother is to educate the girls and young women. Here comes the difficulty. She is to be trained and prepared for her sphere. Very little of that is now done in the schools and colleges. Great attention is given to prepare her for teacher and business; but where in Ohio among Protestant schools can be found one that keeps in real view her sex and her position in life, and furnishes an education suitable for it? The air is full of the false, both in regard to education and in regard to labor and life. It is looked upon as a disgrace for a girl to take service in a family, though there is opportunity for remunerative labor

and a fitting for life; whereas office and store do not fit for the real calling of life and can often be obtained only by the sacrifice of what ought to be dearer than life itself. That is a perversion of education which makes other spheres of labor more honorable than that of the family. Who can fill the position of help-meet and mother without assuming the cares of such family life, even if the labors are lightened by the help of others? Parents often fail to give such information as they ought to impart. It is often the result of no proper appreciation of these things, and the vitiated moral position of the community upon them. Is that daughter educated who can entertain her father in literature and art, but cannot prepare him a healthful meal? Is that wife educated who can pass judgment upon the methods of teaching and the rendition of a piece of music, but cannot take scissors and needle and fit garments to her offspring? Is that mother educated who can brilliantly entertain her distinguished company, but cannot find time and heart to look after the little needs and wants and heart-life of those whom God has put into her care?

Some of our congregations and pastors are doing nobly in training the boys and girls in parochial schools. But in the formative period in the girl's life she is turned over to public, state or sectarian schools—the very time she ought to be under the hallowed and motherly care of her own parent church. Here I might pause and put a great question: Do the Educated Educate? Why this failure in education both with men and women? The answer is, the educated do not ponder these things as they ought. They do not see it and feel it deeply. They do not commune with the Lord over it until like Paul they can do all things through Christ who strengthens them. And here let us say is the great want in the world among men, and especially among the educated, even of our own communion. Church and school work languish for want of men who are living and consecrated enthusiasts in their chosen callings and places. The cry is money; money to equip schools and to prepare men, and to supply them in the work with living means. Money is a good thing, especially when people are starving amidst plenty for want of money. But money will no more solve

the question of education and church activity and success than the alchemist can produce the gold needed in commerce. What can do it? The answer must ever be, educated men and women. Just as soon as we see and feel as we ought in these matters God will open a way to obtain them. People rarely get higher and further in these divine things than they covet. We must want it better, if it is to be better. If we want it different it must come to be such a living and throbbing thing in our beings that we cannot but speak what we see and know. If Christian education does not give us such men and women there is something wrong with it. It does not educate. There is no throb and pulse in it. The natural talents are not so directed and controlled and sanctified that the most is made of them. It becomes weakness to be enthusiastic; success creates opposition. We hear the call of God but it is feeble and finally dies away. We complain and growl and mutter; but we do not take it to the Lord until we get the wisdom and courage that will enable us to prune and lop off where all see it should be done, and to undertake where a need presents itself. We are hearers of the Word, but in the living and higher sense not doers.

A few suggestions must close this address. Our college alumni includes only a portion of the men identified with our work and institutions here. There are those who are graduates of our seminary but not of the college. Why not have also our seminary alumni, and then so arrange our festivities as to make it profitable for our graduates all to gather here once in a year in joyful and brotherly reunion? I suggest that our reunions be controlled by an executive committee which shall prepare a systematic and valuable course of topics for our meetings, embracing literary and social and church subjects, that will be of lasting benefit, and thus make it worth every one's time to be among the bretheren.

It seems we are to have our schools now in operation permanently closed to our girls. Will we go on from year to year always wishing and never doing? There is one way out of this dilemma. Agitate the matter. Bring it to our people. Discuss it, urge it, pray for it, write about it. Is

there not some one who will feel the call of God to this work, and who will go at it, organize a seminary for higher education of our girls and then combine a normal with it, where all of us can send our girls for an education such as they need for church and home? That is done successfully elsewhere. A fine patronage for such a school, put upon a proper basis, can be obtained here in Ohio. There is another way. A mutual organization could be formed in our midst from pastors and people, that would be able to provide the necessary buildings, and then the enterprise would pay itself. If it were located in the right place and backed by the right people, by our own pastors and congregations, and under the proper control, the movement would be flourishing and self-sustaining from the beginning.

A graduate ought to be an example in the way of education. He ought to create an educational atmosphere where he lives. The example of Luther in church and state, of Daniel Webster in state, of Froebel in the sphere of the youth, and of many men and women in most all countries, and nearly every locality has one, is inspiring, and calls on to higher and more consecrated life and activity. We plead for higher ideals; we plead for more earnest effort; we plead for more concerted action and for greater activity among our graduates. One way to advertise our school is to be living examples ourselves of the true graduate; men whose sympathies reach out to all and whose love for humanity makes us all things to all men that we might reach and influence some in God's way. Education should be a moral power to be used only for man's good. Here the fruit of the graduate comes to perfection. It must begin in the individual, expand in the family, blossom in the state and ripen in the sphere of the church. Who is to control the surging masses of society? Shall it be left to the anarchist and socialist, the Herr Mosts and the Debbses? The educated must get into sympathy and communication with the masses, and devise some plan by which true education can educate and elevate the people. Amidst all our boast of a free school system and popular education the rising generation largely fails in good judgment and in that deep and abiding love for parent and home and God, that are the

bulwark of a nation. When men are idle and hungry he is the teacher who gives work and bread. But the power of self-control and of true moral restraint must be looked after in the educational course. And as far as possible this must be brought down to the child-life, to the life of the boy and girl, to the life of the young man and the young woman. Character must be formed, and the power of decision imparted. A lecture against Spiritualism was announced a few weeks ago; a lady with whom I was in conversation said, "No, I will not go to hear it." "Well, why not?" I asked. I knew she was opposed to the ism and was glad men could expose the fraud. She answered: "My parents, now passed into the blessed life with Christ, taught me that I must have nothing to do with such things; the Bible is against it, our holy religion is against it, and I have no call to meet and refute it, I will have nothing to do even with this lecture." Here is an example of an education worthy of praise. It formed character. It gave decision. It left no room for doubt, but placed all on the side of the Lord and His Word. The best equipped men and the most devout and pious women ought to come from our schools. What is the duty of the graduate? Do the Educated Educate?

SOME HINDRANCES IN JEWISH MISSIONS: AND HOW TO REMOVE THEM.

BY REV. A. R. KULDELL, ALLEGHENY, PA.

Anyone who has made an effort to bring the Jews to Christ knows that it is the hardest work in the world. He is beset by hindrances on every hand. We want to look at these hindrances and ask whether they cannot possibly be removed.

I.

HINDRANCES FROM THE JEWS.

1. The natural heart. In former years, when I knew little about heathen missions, I used to envy the missionaries going out to the great multitudes of those sitting in

darkness and in the shadow of death. My imagination pictured to me lovely scenes. I saw the man of God as the angel of peace delivering his heavenly message to great throngs who like the dry ground were parching for the heavenly dew of the blessed Gospel. I saw multitudes crying out: Ye men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved? But in the course of time my imagination has cooled down. The fact is that the missionary among the heathen as well as the laborer among the Jews has to deal with the same human heart which before the new birth from above is desperately wicked in Jew and Gentile alike. "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jew and Gentile, that they are all under sin; as it is written: There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none, that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God." Rom. 3, 9-11. Many a missionary has labored among the heathen for years and years without seemingly making the least impression upon the callous hearts of the Gentiles and we must not think it a strange thing when we find that the natural heart of the Jew receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, that it is all foolishness to him.

2. Prejudice. Over and above the natural heart which he shares with the Gentile, the Jew is prejudiced against Christ more than any heathen that treads the earth. Children are taught on their mother's lap to despise the name of Christ, to abhor the religion of Christ and to spit upon the cross of Christ. You would shudder, if I would proceed to illustrate this truth by giving their faith and practice in this regard. July the first, 1897, I was in New York for a few days to study the Jewish missionary problem — the results of those observations being partially incorporated in this paper — just then it happened that there was a commotion among the teeming multitudes of the New York Jews. One of their publishers paid a man to translate the Hebrew book: "Sepher Mahseh Thole", "History of the Acts of the Hanged One", into Jargon, and printed a large edition. The original is quite old and its contents are taught by every Jewish mother to her children. The language of the book itself, however, is filthier than any Jewish mother ever made it. In the new Jargon translation the missionaries received their share of mud, which in the eyes of the publisher made the

book more racy and popular. Anthony Comstock was informed of the unchaste character of the book and the whole edition together with the plates were confiscated by the police. Such books are Israel's teachers. The blind led by the blind. Oh God, how kind and great art Thou, that Thou hast opened the eyes of such a blind wretch as I have been!

But the Jews are not only prejudiced against Christ, but also against Christianity, and this their prejudice is not altogether without foundation. The Christians, the followers of a corrupt Christianity before and after the Reformation, have so often, so long, so outrageously persecuted the Jews, that their historians, novelists and journalists never tire of regaling their readers with the bloody tales of gore. How can a religion, they ask, whose adherents are capable of such fiendish, outrageous deeds be the religion of Jehovah and His Anointed? Such a question is natural.

3. Ostracism. Another hindrance in the Jewish missionary work is the utter contempt in which the convert is held among his own people. He is considered by his own family and friends as one that is dead. He is disinherited and bewailed as one that is forever lost. Here is a characteristic letter from a Jewish lady in England who was informed by her brother in the United States that he became a Christian:

"This morning I have bidden farewell to one of the brightest hopes of my life; have bidden adieu forever to a long cherished dream, namely of seeing you one of the foremost men of the day, not only in public life, but in congregational matters also. If I wrote forever I could not express the deep grief and sorrow your letter has cost our dear mother and myself. This morning the light that has been to me a beacon of all that is good and true, as a rock to lean on when it shall please the Almighty to call our darling mother to Himself — that light has gone out forever, and I almost think that I would sooner have heard that God had taken you than that you should have lived to become what you are; almost sooner know that you are not responsible for your actions than that you should be held accountable to our Maker for what you have done. I think you have killed the best half of my life. Why did you do it? I am

sure, if you had come back to us, we could have made you happy. I am sure we would have done anything for you, we all love you so. Now all is over forever. As I am writing I am shedding the bitterest tears of my life," etc., etc. It surely takes the stoutest hearts and a goodly measure of power from on high to take the cross of Christ upon oneself in the face of such heart-rending prospects of separation and woe.

Can these hindrances be removed? What is our duty in this regard as co-laborers with God?

1) Preach the Word. The power of the Gospel is not worn out yet. Men's hearts are not harder to-day than ever and man's need of salvation is not smaller to-day than ever, and how comforting to know that God's Word is just as powerful as ever. "Is not my Word like a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. 23, 29. Even the hearts of the most fanatic Jews, as well as the hearts of the most indifferent rationalistic "moderns", have been gained and rescued by the blessed Gospel of the Lord Jesus. A man who just left my house is an illustration of the latter kind. He belongs to a Jewish family of the most prominent merchants of our city. He was an infidel as most of the rich Jews are. By the power of the Gospel he was drawn to the cross of Christ. He suffered the loss of all things. Satan, not succeeding in drawing him from Christ by persecution and deprivation of all things earthly, threw him into a vortex of error and vagaries, but the blessed Word is achieving one victory over another and he is now beginning to bask in the blessed sunshine of pure Gospel truth.

Preach the Word. It has overcome our stubborn hearts, it can melt other Jewish hearts as well.

2) Practice what you preach. The inveterate prejudice of the Jewish hearts against Christ and His blessed religion can only be overcome by a pious consistent life of those who profess Christianity. The unchristian life of many so-called Christians is doing great damage in the field of heathen missions and more yet in the field of Jewish missions, for the Jew has a keener eye to observe and is sitting in the very lap of Christendom. If it had not been my

blessed privilege to meet some pious Lutheran Christians in my native city, I would never have known, from my many Catholic acquaintances, that Christianity was anything else but a civilized heathenism. Let the Spirit of Christ penetrate every fibre of our being and even the Jews in our midst will feel the blessed effect. When the Church of God has awakened from cold formality and indifference to a living realization of her great privileges and obligations, then her holy life and zeal will be a blessed epistle read by all men, even by the Jews, and their prejudice will die.

3. As to the removal of the hindrance mentioned under 3, viz.: ostracism, painful separation and loss of all things, no power could remedy this evil so much as the power of the pure Word preached to them and of a godly life lived before them, as we pointed out already. We only like to mention a third remedy as an aid to the rest, and that is dissemination of missionary literature. Dispel the darkness of their ignorance and superstition and you lessen their prejudice, their hatred and malice against their brethren embracing Christianity. And a great many who will never be reached by a living voice of Christ's witnesses can be reached through the printed page. This is the reason that the writer has urged Joint Synod to create a tract depository from which ministers and laymen having the salvation of the Jews at heart, could get suitable literature for the Jews of their neighborhood. The tract depository is in our hands now. Dear reader, did you ever help to supply its demands? Will you help to bear the light where darkness is still enveloping the hearts?

This brings us to another field of thought, viz.:

II.

THE HINDRANCES TO THE CONVERSION OF ISRAEL AS THEY COME FROM CHRISTIANS.

1. A sleeping conscience with regard to our duty towards Israel.

I must confess that I myself was often tempted to divorce myself from this activity altogether. It often seems an unthankful task whichever way I take it. Besides, the office of the ministry in a congregation located amidst rival

churches of our own and other denominations offers enough labor and vexation of heart without the exhausting task of laboring among the Jews. I am here therefore not to condemn others, but to state the fact, that the majority of us have succeeded in lulling conscience to sleep with regard to this duty. This sleep has become contagious. When the leaders of the Church find it more convenient to say nothing and do nothing for this work, why should not the rest follow suit? Besides, doing nothing is so easy. Of course, this charge will not hold good with regard to other activities of the Church. In other respects we may be doing too much — I cannot digress here — but with regard to the evangelization of the Jews we are doing little or nothing. To the bulk of us it seems an amateur activity which can be comfortably left to those who feel like it. What wonder that there is a lack of personal effort on the part of pastors and people? What wonder that there is a lack of means for the humblest efforts? What wonder that there is a lack of heavenly blessings on our small efforts when so few plead for them?

2. Another hindrance to the successful evangelization of the Jews is the injudicious choice of laborers on the part of the Church. We ourselves have been guilty of this fault which we here censure. We have paid dear for our experience, but if there is comfort in company, we have learned and distinguished companions especially in the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country. Numerous missions begun by them were manned by untried converts. These laborers were put into the field on the strength of good recommendations, as was the case with one man in Pittsburg, but in this field recommendations go for nothing. Those numerous missions thus manned were enthusiastically begun, languidly dragged on, and soon ingloriously given up. The Church wanted to fight the Lord's battles with raw, unskilled, undisciplined, and sometimes cowardly recruits. Anything seemed good enough for the Jews. This gave rise to self-appointed missionaries whom nobody called, but who called on everybody for money. Such independent, untried men, responsible to nobody, having access to everybody, often fell under the weight of injudicious overwhelming love on the part of well-meaning Christians.

3. Another hindrance in the successful operation

among the Jews, and according to the consensus of all missionaries the most perplexing of all, is the fact that it falls to the lot of the missionary in most cases to help the convert to an honest occupation and Christian calling, if the convert is not to sink into utter destitution of body and soul. By becoming a Christian the convert mostly loses his livelihood among the Jews. They will not patronize him, they will not employ him, they would rather starve him. A great many of them who are most susceptible of Christian impressions, the talmudists, the students, the precantors and others whose life's work is in the sphere of Jewish religion must when converted be taught a trade, must be trained to make themselves useful and earn an honest living. This is the hardest task of all. In the first place the response to the missionary's appeals for employment in behalf of such converts is mostly in the negative even by those who profess to be followers of Christ. In the second place, if he himself would undertake the training of such people, he is lacking the means. This is the greatest hindrance in the prosecution of Jewish missionary work. It helps the inquirer to abandon the thought of ever becoming a Christian. It hinders the missionary to encourage to a step which might plunge the convert into utter destitution and misery. These are facts and no fancies.

Can these hindrances be removed?

1. The sleeping conscience, who can awaken it? With God all things are possible. When my flesh and my friends counsel me to abandon the work, my conscience cries out: No! God wills it. The Jews are in need of salvation. The multitude of the orthodox are laboring for that which is no bread. By their self-righteousness and work-righteousness they dug unto themselves cisterns that are full of holes and finding not what they seek they are famishing for that water of life which washes away our sin and brings that peace which passeth knowledge. Thousands and tens of thousands are drifting away from the old moorings of formalism and orthodoxism landing upon the dangerous paths of Nihilism and Anarchy. God has given us the means of salvation and the Son of God before His ascension has laid the great commission upon the heart of His Church: Preach the Gospel to every creature. How can we prove loyalty to our King better than by filial obedience? Wherever His will is

obeyed and the Gospel is brought to the Jews in persevering faith, there the labors have been blessed. Rev. Foltin in Kishenew, South Russia, is pastor of a Lutheran congregation, is military chaplain and Probst or Superintendent of a whole diocese in South Russia, yet he finds time to direct the work of Jewish missions and the Lord has blessed his work beyond measure. Since 1864, when Rabbi Emland, the first convert, was baptized, he clings to the work and hundreds have been brought to Christ — and the present writer too is looking up to him as his spiritual father. First sowing, then reaping. When in mission halls of London or New York the Gospel is to-day brought to the Jews they mostly flock to hear it. It was not so at first. A venerable missionary, a Jewish convert, who has been laboring among the Jews in New York in connection with the Episcopal Church for over 30 years told the writer that when he first commenced his work among them, he found their fury worse than that of cannibals. He was in danger of his life daily. It is different to-day. And yet how few and weak the laborers and how great the multitude of the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Three hundred thousand Jews in New York and half a dozen missionaries! The more I read the Word of God and Jewish missionary literature and the more I come in contact with the Jews, the less am I able to lull my conscience to sleep with the excuse we can not do it. He does not require anything we cannot do. Think of the Moravians, a denomination of about 30,000 people, spending over \$90,000 a year for heathen missions. We can do many times more than the Moravians, if we are constrained by the same love of Christ. Awake ye children of the kingdom, the Spirit and the bride say "come", and let him who hears say "come." Ours is to obey, to serve, to be of the same mind with Him, to do the work and let Him take care of the consequences. If we lived a life of consecration and obedience, we would do our duty and bring the Gospel to the Jews whether they hear or forbear.

2. Let us pray for, and choose from, the best men in the Church and give them a salary sufficient to enable them to devote themselves body and mind and soul to this hardest of all tasks on the face of the earth. Cheap men are often too cheap for anything. And if thoroughness and consecration

and burning zeal are required anywhere, they are required here in the field of Jewish missions. I am not of the opinion that a Jewish missionary must be a Jewish Christian. Men go forth to foreign lands and spend years in acquiring a foreign tongue, they expose themselves to all kinds of murderous climates in order to bring benighted souls to the light of the Gospel. Here is a field inviting the most talented, the most devoted without requiring new tongues, but simply a good acquaintance with Hebrew. Here are no climatic dangers threatening, but the one danger of living in the chilling atmosphere of little faith. Why should not the best sons of the Church give themselves to this work? Raise the standard of the laborers and the mission cause will gain in the estimation of Jews and Christians alike.

There is another conviction which I share with others. It is this: As matters now stand it would be better to connect this work with the work of the congregation. Let the Mission Board make arrangements with the pastor and congregation located in a Jewish center; let a man be placed as an assistant pastor called by the congregation to help the pastor *loci* in evangelizing the Jews in that locality. The assistant could be supported by the mission treasury. The name mission, to the Jews so odious, would fall away, the converts could be incorporated into the life of a Christian congregation. The assistant pastor would have a better access to the Jews as pastor than he would have as missionary; he could stand it longer by moving also in Christian circles, among friends, and not always among Jews and foes. The spirit of missions would grow among the people of God, they would be enlisted into personal effort, the congregation would be blessed and would thus become a blessing to others. Is this Utopian? Children of God, think — and act on these things!

3. The greatest difficulty of all is not insurmountable either. Probst Foltin, whom I mentioned above, had connected an inquirer's home and a kind of an industrial school with his missionary work from the very beginning. In many cases the seed of the Gospel would never germinate if the hearts would be left to the hawk of Jewish parents and relatives. Honest inquirers are offered the privilege of a quiet Christian home where the Gospel is taught and lived.

Those who lost the means of sustenance are taught a trade or are provided with employment among Christian people. Missionary societies in Germany, England, and Scandinavia often helped Rev. Foltin in making useful Christian men and women of his converts. Now and then some weeds would crop up from among the wheat; but on the whole it is the best way of missionating after all. Rev. Foltin even affirms it is the only way. "Missionary work among the Jews without the proper care of the converts (*proselytenpflege*) is sin." This is the result of his 35 or 40 years' experience in this field. What would have become of most of the converts if the Church had left them to take care of themselves? If Jewish converts have become a blessing to society and the Church each one of them will in most cases have to confess: By grace and the Samaritan love of the Church I am what I am. 'This is the love I am pleading for in this field of mission activity — a love that identifies itself with the object in need. This love is far-reaching. It embraces both soul and body, the temporal as well as the spiritual welfare. Do we ask anything unreasonable or unscriptural or anything impossible? Christian love has founded institutions for the orphan, the aged, the infirm, the lame, and the blind, why not for the found but disabled and improvident sheep of the house of Israel?

We are done. We have told the Church of the difficulties in this field of God's vineyard and how to remove them. We have been guided by experience, a good teacher, and by the Spirit of Christ, the best teacher. Now it remains to be seen what the Church, what you, dear reader, will do. Ponder over it, pray over it, and — act on it. Life's little day is soon gone. Soon the night cometh, when no man can work.

It is the peace of Jerusalem for which we are pleading and we are told they must prosper that love her.

THE ORIGIN OF OUR DATE FOR CHRISTMAS.

BY REV. PROF. A. NEBE, D. D., TRANSLATED BY F. W. ABICHT,
A. B., MARYSVILLE, OHIO.

As is well known, Christmas is not the oldest festival of the church. It is, so to say, the youngest of the three great festivals. And for a long time its youth was quite evident from the fact that it took fully one thousand years before it grew up to the dignity of a three days' celebration, like the other great festivals. The second Christmas day was first looked upon as a Saints' day: it was dedicated to a martyr of the church, St. Stephen. Augustine says in a sermon: "*Natalem Domini hesterna die celebravimus, servi hodie natalem celebramus sed natalem Domini celebravimus, quo nasci dignatus est, natalem servi celebramus, quo coronatus est (serm. 314)*".¹ The third Christmas day was celebrated in honor of the Apostle St. John. This combination is very ingenious and is explained by an old hymn:

Verbum Dei, Deo natum,
Quod nec factum, nec creatum,
Venit de coelestibus:
Hoc vidit, hoc attrectavit,
Hoc de coelo reseravit,
Joannes hominibus.²

Luther was the pioneer of a better system. He relegated the anniversary of the martyr and the apostle to the rear: he did not abolish their celebration, but left it optional; but he put the pericopes for the second and third

¹ Yesterday we celebrated the birthday of the Master, to-day we celebrate the birthday of a servant; the birthday of the Master we celebrated, because he is supposed to have been born on that day, the birthday of the servant we celebrated, because he was crowned. (The ancient church celebrated a member's death anniversary rather than his birthday, i. e., his birth into the everlasting life, rather than that into this life.—Tr.)

² The Word of God born of God, which was not made nor created, came from the heavens; this Word John has seen and touched and revealed from heaven unto men.

Christmas days in the place of the others. This was a significant hint, which, leaving his own postils out of consideration, was fully appreciated and heeded. It was in Germany and through Luther that Christmas at first attained its full measure of rights as a great festival. This is apparent also from the fact that among no Christian people this festival is celebrated with as much pleasure and zest as among the Germans. It is in Germany that Christmas is a real national holiday, a Christian festival of the German people.

From the Occident Christmas found its way to the Orient, and in the middle of the fourth century an exchange of festivals took place. The Orient gave the Occident its Epiphany festival, and the Occident gave the Orient its Christmas. Chrysostom tells us in a sermon preached in A. D. 386 (in natalem Christi diem. Montf. 2, 354ff.) that the celebration of Christmas had been in vogue in the Church of Antioch for only ten years, while in the Occident it had been observed from the beginning. This latter expression (ἀνωθεν) dare not be pressed, however. The first decided traces of Christmas celebration we do not discover until the middle of the fourth century. Ambrosius relates that the Roman Bishop Liberius (352-366) invested his sister Marcellina as a nun on the birthday of the Lord. Thus also in a chronological compilation of Mommsen, that in 354 we find in two different places that Jesus Christ is said to have been born at Bethlehem, VII Cal. Jan., namely December 25th. Chrysostom, in the sermon alluded to, says that everywhere there is considerable discussion, pro and con, about this date, it being contended, on the one hand, that the holiday was somewhat new and recent and of but late origin: on the other hand it was defended as old and fixed. At present hardly anyone will take the extraordinary rapid adoption of the date by the churches of the Orient as a valid proof that December 25th is in reality the date of the birthday of our Lord. And so the question arises: What moved the Church of the Occident to adopt this date and no other?

Chrysostom claims that in the records of the decree of Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed, the Roman Church has found the date of Christ's birth. But

the church-father is mistaken. Even if these records had been preserved in the Roman state archives, which is also claimed by Tertullian, the name of Jesus would not be found in them, much less any information about his birthday: for only the names of the tax-payers would be recorded, and not even these were so recorded, but only the number. Since neither the Canonical nor the Apocryphal Gospels contain anything about the date of Christ's birth, the 25th of December has no historical foundation, as also the Bishop James of Edessa says, and that as late as the seventh century, that no one really knows the date of Christ's birth.

Now it is a well-nigh universally promulgated opinion, voiced by the great writers of church history, Neander, Gieseler, and all archæologists, that December 25th became popular, because it was at the same time the date for one of the Roman feasts. On this date the Romans are said to have pompously celebrated a sun festival, called *natalis invicti*: more than that, all kinds of festivals happened to fall in the second half of December, above all, the *Saturnalia*, which were dedicated to the memory of the vanished Golden Age, and which were to give reality to the hope of those glorious days painted by the poets in most glorious colors. But the belief that Christendom patterned after the festivals of the heathen is a delusion; and what is of special importance here, the *Saturnalia*, the principal day of which was on December 17th, ended already on the 23d. Hence, Christmas does not at all coincide with the *Saturnalia*, unless it as *post festum* was to be a kind of equivalent for the bygone days of revelry. And as to the festival of the unconquered sun (for *solis* must be supplied after *invicti*), ancient Rome never knew anything about it. Appeal is taken to the note of aforesaid chronographical work of the year 354, referring to December 25th—*natalis invicti*: and it is thought that, since this is the day on which the sun has reached its lowest mark and begins to rise, the sun is meant by the *invictus*. But the sun is never called simply *invictus*. Moreover, *invictus* is by no means the epitheton ornans of the sun. In that old, old calendar many an item is found, relating to the sun, where the noun *sol* is never wanting, *invictus* is never found by itself. We can therefore accept

only Mommsen's opinion, which has recently been energetically defended, according to which *natalis invicti* designates the birthday of Emperor Constance, ruling at that time, who was really born on that day, December 25th. I will add that the calendar contains several more similar data from the lives and administrations of the emperors, and that a festival of the winter-solstice was not celebrated in the Roman Empire until some time in the second half of the fourth century. Indeed, Emperor Julian (361-363), who made the last attempt to suppress Christianity in the Roman Empire and to lend a crutch to decrepit heathendom by magnificent sacrifices and new festivals, designated December 25th for this sun festival, in order to offer a pitiable substitute for Christmas.

In a great measure Christian festivals have their type in the Jewish festivals. Easter is the transfiguration of the Old Testament Passover. Pentecost, when the first fruits of the Spirit were harvested, is the fulfillment of the Israelitic Pentecost, when the first fruits of the harvest were brought to the sanctuary with praise and thanksgiving. Would it not seem as though the date for Christmas were borrowed from a Jewish festival? Has our Christmas celebration a type in one of the Jewish festivals? This very thing has been claimed, and that not only in recent days by Prof. Paulus Cassel (*Christmas, Its Origin, Customs and Superstition*, p. 89ff.) a proselyte from Israel,—but already in the eighteenth century by a certain Oldermann. Josephus relates that in his time a festival, called "Lights" was celebrated in honor of the purification of the Temple, accomplished by Judas Maccabæus (*Ant.* 12, 7, 7). This purification, called the dedication of the Temple, Chanuka, was celebrated on the 25th of Kishlev. The corner-stone of the temple which Zerubbabel built unto the Lord after the return from the Babylonian captivity, was laid on the ninth month on the 24th day, i. e., the 24th Kishlev; thus also, according to Haggai 2, 20ff. the new temple which God was about to build should be erected on the same day. But Christ is this true, living temple of God, in which the glory of God was to dwell among the children of men. Since the old temple was a type of the Lord, who was the new temple in Spirit and in truth, thus also the 24th day of the ninth

month was determinative for the birth of Christ. Our 25th day of December corresponds to the 24th day of Kishlev, it is said. Regarding such a derivation of December 25th as the date for the birth of Christ we have great doubts, which in our opinion are quite justifiable. That passage of Haggai, on which after all the whole argument is built, does not even hint at an erection of a new temple, does not in the least allude to the Messianic temple. The prophet only says that God will shake the heavens and the earth, overthrow the throne of kingdoms and destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen; he is ominously silent as to a temple dedication which the Messiah is to perform in His time. The Jewish exegetes also have never found that this passage speaks of the advent of the Messiah to a temple dedication: the Israelite never suspected that there was even an iota about his temple, i. e., his own righteousness, which needed purification, he regarded his worship as perfect. If the day of the temple dedication is the origin of Christmas, this Christian festival would certainly not have begun its march of victory through the world from the Occident. In the Orient the Jews lived much more densely congregated than in the Occident, and there, much more than here, had the church built itself up with Jewish elements. There the Jewish Sabbath was for a long time celebrated besides the Christian Sunday (Cf. Const. Apost. 7, 23)³ and this without fasting, i. e., festively⁴ (Can. Apost. 66). But the Occidental church, especially the congregation at Rome, stood aloof from all judaizing doings and set up the strictest opposition against retaining Jewish festivals and customs. I draw attention to the fact that this church advisedly adopted her Scripture lessons only from the Gospels and the Epistles, and I will add that it evinced this anti-Jewish spirit by fasting on the Sabbath, for which montanistic Tertullian reproves the Romans (de jej. 14) and which the Concilium Illiberitanum made a rule for Spain and which Innocent I (402-417) raised to the dignity

³ Celebrate the Sabbath, but also the Lord's day.

⁴ If any officer of the church be found fasting on the Lord's day or on the Sabbath, more than on one alone, he shall be deposed, but if he be a lay-member, he shall be excommunicated.

of a general church law in a decretal (*sabbato vero jejundum esse ratio evidentissima demonstrat*).⁵ The Occident would have been altogether untrue to itself, if it had chosen this date on account of a Jewish festival. Moreover, to hold that the 24th Kishlev corresponds to our 25th December, which has been all along supposed in this theory, is an error. The year of the Jews, which begins with the first new moon in spring, is also composed of months, but not such months as ours. The months of the Jews are real, true "moons", i. e., they are determined by the circumvolution of the moon around the earth. The ninth month of the Jews, here in question, Kishlev, coincides with the latter part of November and the fore part of December, and Kishlev 24th generally falls on the 17th of December, and by no means on the 25th. Besides, since the Jews do not determine their festivals according to the normal year, but according to the different phases of the moon, we would have no fixed date for our festival: like Easter and Pentecost, which are determined according to these phases, the Christian festival would occur from November to December.

It is universally conceded that the old Christian almanac contains an allegorical computation of time. Might we not, if we proceeded from this point, arrive at a solution of this enigmatical date? Let us follow the footprints of Prof. Piper, who is an authority on sacred archæology and calendar computation.

Philo assumes that the world was created in spring at the time of the Equinox, cf. *opif. mundi* No. 13. Origen holds the same position. As light and darkness were separated and the sun appointed to rule the day and the moon the night, it follows, according to him, that the time of the Equinox was the time of the Creation, because the separation is to be viewed as a perfect one, as one that separates into equal parts. The vernal Equinox was preferred to the autumnal by Origen, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Ambrosius and others. Victor, Bishop of Capua (about 550) shows us the reason. "Should the world," he asks, "have been created in autumn? For sorrow is characteristic of this season,

⁵ That fasting ought to be observed on the Sabbath a very clear ground goes to show.

when the trees are stripped of their foliage, the earth is bare of fruits and the weather is inconstant. If it is permitted to have an opinion about the matter, pray, tell me, is it reasonable to suppose that the world was created at any other time of the year than in the spring, when we know that the world was the very picture of festivity? 'Tis then that the earth is arrayed in flowers, mild winds are whispering, the sun sends forth its beams at the time of the Equinox and points to its birthday, progressing from the beginning of spring in the growth of longer days."

Now, according to the Julian calendar, the vernal Equinox falls on the 25th of March. This day, then, is, according to the views of the church-fathers just quoted, the birthday of the world. About the middle of the third century a writing incorporated into the works of Cyprian expressly designates the 25th of March as the birthday of the world, i. e., the first day of the Creation. The work of Creation corresponds to the work of Redemption. As God in the beginning said, "Let there be light!" so in the fullness of time He again said, "Let there be light!" and there was light. But the whole work of the Redemption is dependent on the person of the Redeemer, on the historical Jesus Christ. While the heretics of the first century rejected the coming of the Son of God into the flesh and taught instead a more or less intimate union of the Son of God or also of the Holy Spirit with the man Christ Jesus, the apostolic and patristic church was free of such creations of fancy. Jesus Christ, so the Holy Scriptures teach, increased in wisdom, stature and favor with God and man: the Son of God truly became man, was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary—this is the apostolic doctrine. If the work of the Redemption is the counterpart of the Creation, then the first day of the Creation, March 25th, must also be the day wherein the Lord was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and accordingly December 25th must be the day wherein He was born of the Virgin Mary, if justice is to be done to allegory and symbolics.

Against this parallel it has been argued that a parallel of the work of the Creation and the work of the Redemption is not to be found in the ancient church's whole range of ideas: that only one figure from the whole sphere of

Creation, Adam, the first man, was a type of Jesus Christ, the second Adam, the man from heaven. This objection, made by Cassel, has nothing in its favor. The celebration of Sunday is the unanimous protest of the old church, the most striking refutation of this objection. Sunday, the Lord's day, celebrates the first day of the week, i. e., since the week represents the time of the Creation, the first day of Creation. Moreover, the fact that the old church put the date of the Crucifixion on the date of Creation, deserves consideration. I do not see how it could more definitely declare that the Creation is the type of the Redemption.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SOUL.

BY REV. PROF. L. H. SCHUH, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

From time immemorial both philosophical and theological research has been compelled to battle with the question: What of the soul; whence is it? The origin of the body is to a great extent a matter of observation. While we do not understand all the secret processes of propagation, yet since the body is material, its preparation, to a certain extent, comes under the observation of the senses. That men inherit their bodies from their progenitors is plain and beyond dispute. But when we come to the other component of human nature, the soul, we are everywhere shrouded in mystery. Observation here goes for naught since the soul is immaterial and does not come under the observation of the senses. Reason and speculation are equally powerless to solve the question. Even the power of introspection possessed by the soul is of no avail. Mental phenomena may be cognized under the light of consciousness and many mental processes may be unravelled. The highest form of consciousness, self-consciousness, by which the soul knows itself apart from other things can throw no light upon this question, for when the soul has passed from the unconscious into the conscious state, thus becoming aware of its own activities, it is already in existence. Our own experience and observation upon others, shows that we enter this life,

if not unconscious of everything, yet certainly unconscious of self. We emerge from darkness to twilight, and from twilight to daylight. When the soul has developed consciousness and self-consciousness, i. e. when it becomes aware of its activities, it is already in existence. No mental activity or the observation of it throws any light upon the origin of the soul. Here as elsewhere our only hope of solution lies in Revelation and even this does not fully lift the veil and expose to our gaze the mysterious process of the origin of the soul.

Three theories have been propounded to solve the enigma. The first of these is called:

PRE-EXISTENCE.

This theory maintains that the soul had an existence in another state or possibly world and that at the propagation of a human body in this life it becomes incarnate. The soul then does not begin its existence in time but in eternity. It is not conscious of existence in a former state, though a few adherents of this theory claim to have a dim recollection of it. This theory really begs the question. The inquiry still arises, based on the law of causality: How did the soul originate in that pristine state? or was it eternal? If the latter is true, it passes beyond the comprehension of the finite mind, for this cannot grasp the infinite, and we are no nearer the solution than we were at the outset. Did the soul originate spontaneously in that former state, or had it a Creator and who was He? On these questions the theory is silent. It simply cuts the Gordian knot, but does not untie it.

The advocates of this theory maintain it, because to them it contains the only plausible explanation of the radical evil in man. This radical evil would imply the exercise of choice with respect to sin; now as man cannot exercise it in this life, being born a sinner without the privilege of exercising such choice, it necessarily follows that he must have done so in a former state. Such then as fall in that state are incarnate in this. Here they have original sin. Thus the justice of God is vindicated, who permits every man to exercise a choice with respect to sin. But to put a human being into a sinful state without such a choice would be the height of injustice. This reasoning has much speciousness, but it

cannot stand the test of Scripture, or even of human experience.

According to this theory parents would in a very subordinate sense be the progenitors of their children. With the essential part of the child's nature they have nothing to do. But observation teaches that children not only resemble their parents in body, but equally as much in mind. Why is it that all the children of a family, and not only of a generation but for generations, show the same mental characteristics, if souls are simply incarnated into these natural bodies? The question is unsolvable according to the pre-existence theory.

If a fall in an ante-natal state incurred incarnation as its punishment, strange that the soul has no recollection of it. That fall must have been a personal, conscious act of ours, otherwise there could have been no choice. That fall must have resulted in a change of state; yet the soul so suffering for sin has no recollection of any choice or existence in a pre-temporal state. We do know that the soul passing now from time to eternity bears with it the recollection of these earthly scenes. There is no break or blank in memory and of consciousness. We shall be self-conscious there as we are here. We shall be conscious of being the same persons there that we are here. The continuity of consciousness will be maintained and upon this very thing will depend the acquiescence of the saved or damned in their lot. Then why should the soul carry this consciousness of self out of time, but not into it?

Pre-existence militates against the scriptural doctrine of the necessity of universal redemption. If the fallen in that state are incarnated in this, why should some of the pure not be sent down, or possibly crave to come down to act as prophets of righteousness, to be exemplars to terrestrials and point them to the way of escape? May there not some be walking this earth who are simply visitants of a better world, who are untainted by sin and therefore not in need of redemption? The Bible answers that question by emphasizing the necessity of universal redemption.

In its more rudimentary state this theory is but metempsychosis of the ancients. In its higher form its chief pagan

exponent was Plato. In his "Republic", book X, he says in the concluding paragraphs: "He was one of those who came from heaven, and in a former life had dwelt in a well-ordered state, but his virtue was a matter of habit only and he had no philosophy." This view of Plato was only a logical deduction and consequence of his "Theory of Ideas", the centre of his philosophical system. From Plato the theory passed over to Philo and through him to Origen. Thus it gained an entrance into the Church, though it cannot be said that at any time it met with general acceptance. Later the Council at Constantinople expressly condemned it. In later times Kant and Schelling revived the theory. Julius Mueller in his work "On Sin" defended it. It is an essential tenet of the Theosophists of our day, and by it they attempt to explain the origin of sin and its consequences, genius, the necessity of other worlds and kindred mysterious questions.

The other theory propounded as a solution to our question is called:

CREATIONISM.

This theory maintains that there is a daily creation of souls through an act of omnipotence on the part of the Creator. The body is propagated by natural generation. This foetus is lifeless, or at least soulless. About the fortieth day after conception, a soul is united with the embryo. The soul, then, is an immediate creation of God. It is brought into existence apart from the body. The following are some of the passages upon which this doctrine is said to rest. Jer. 38, 16; Isa. 57, 16; Zech. 12, 1; Acts 17, 28; Ps. 119, 73; Job 16, 12; Numb. 16, 22; Heb. 12, 9. But none of these passages proves more than this, that the spirit of man has higher attributes than his body and that the former is a distinct entity from the latter. They do not prove that God by an immediate creation brought the soul into existence and then incorporated it in this earthly tabernacle.

The following are some of the chief biblical arguments against immediate creationism:

1. The creation of the woman from man. She was made not by an immediate, but by a mediate creation. Gen. 2, 7 we read: And the Lord formed man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.

But in the creation of woman the account simply states that "the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman." From the rib God made the entire woman. But from the dust He made only the body of man, not his soul. Concerning this inbreathing of the soul we have no intimation in the formation of the woman. In the case of Adam there was an immediate creation; in the case of Eve there was a mediate creation. Adam's being was derived from His Maker; Eve's being from that of her husband. Therefore St. Paul also says, 1 Cor. 11, 9: "For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man." (The woman out of man — original).

2. The creation Sabbath. Gen. 2, 2. "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all the works which He had made." This resting of the Creator is simply cessation from His work. He had completed all that He purposed to make and then He ceased from any further creation. Every thing that was made by an immediate creation was made in the six days of creation. Before that time there was nothing visible; after it God made nothing more. The Bible knows nothing of a continued creation. With the end of the sixth day creation ends and preservation begins. But in this work God produces nothing new. He utilizes what is already in existence. Matter may assume new form but it cannot be augmented. True the soul is immaterial, but the same law holds good with regard to the work of God. The soul is a creature and the Creator rested, i. e. He brought no more creatures into existence by an immediate creation. Creationism upsets this truth of Revelation and our observations in nature.

3. Original sin. The Scriptures teach that Adam although deceived by Satan yet sinned of his own free will. In the exercise of this choice Adam turned away from God and by virtue of this fall sin entered into his being not as essence but as accident. Of the creation of Adam we read: "So God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him." But after the fall of Adam we read, Gen. 5, 3: "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his own image." No longer do we read that Adam's children were in the im-

age of God, but in his own image. This son then inherited from his father the image of sin, and this image has passed down upon all men. Men are now conceived and born in sin, not because they exercise any choice in the matter but because by an immediate creation they derive their entire being, body and soul, from their progenitors. Man thus finds when he awakes to self-consciousness the entire periphery of his being, everything that constitutes the "ego", the essence of his being, steeped in sin and this as a result of the immutable law that God continues the world through that which He made in the beginning. Let us for argument's sake assume that creationism is true and follow it to its legitimate consequences. God daily creates souls. These souls as the immediate creation of God are pure, since He cannot make anything evil. These pure souls are placed into fetuses generated some time before. But what of this tabernacle into which this pure soul is placed? It is corruptible; it has the seeds of death in it. It becomes the imperfect tool of a perfect soul. The reciprocal relation between body and soul is of such a character that neither can escape the influence of the other. God then places a soul where it cannot avoid the influence of sin. Adam was so situated that he might or might not sin. There was liberty of choice. But such a pure soul incarnated in a body tainted with sin and death must sin. Then God is responsible for sin. Certainly this is a doctrine of devils. If there is one thing which the Lord impresses upon us in the Bible it is that He is not the author of sin, and that He is in no way responsible for it. Creationism upsets the Biblical doctrine of original sin and robs God of His glory.

4. Incarnation. We are taught that Jesus was "conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary." He is spoken of as the Son of God, but also as the Son of Man. The latter refers especially to His human nature which He assumed from the Virgin Mary. But He assumed through her an entire human nature, which implies a body and a soul. It is this which makes Him our brother, that He shares with us our nature in full. The Scriptures nowhere speak of an immediate creation of the human soul of Christ, but of His generation by the Holy Ghost, of His conception and birth by Mary. If He did not assume His

body and soul from the being of Mary, He did not assume our nature and He is not, therefore, our representative with the Father. If Jesus did not assume His entire nature from Mary's what evidence have we that He was not the incarnation of some other intelligent being coming to this world for pity to point the way upward? None. But if we have not the indubitable evidence that He was a man like unto us in all things essential to our nature, what evidence have we that we are redeemed, seeing that it takes man to redeem man? None. So creationism militates against the Biblical doctrine of incarnation and by implication of redemption.

This view has been extensively held by the Church in the past and is to-day the prevailing view of both the Romish and Calvinistic wing, the former holding it in the interests of pelagianism, the latter of predestinarianism. Jerome was a decided creationist and along with him the greater part of the oriental Church. Lactantius taught that "from souls a soul is not able to be born." Clement of Alexandria held this view and Augustine vacillated between it and traducianism. He would not decide the question. Luther is sometimes counted into this camp, but unjustly. That Rome with its pelagianizing views should hold creationism is natural. The Pelagians "denied that little children born after Adam contract from their very birth the contagion of the old death." "Little children are born without any fetter of original sin." Of course Pelagius was an advocate of this theory. Baptists find in this teaching a support for their rejection of infant baptism. If the souls of children at birth are pure, how can they need regeneration? Therefore away with pedit-baptism.

There is one other view which has been propounded to solve the question as to the origin of the soul. This theory is called:

TRADUCIANISM.

It alone stands the test of Scripture. It sets forth, that both the soul and body of a child are traduced from its parents, that there is just as close a relation between the soul of the child and parent as between their bodies. The theory does not attempt to solve this relation but accepts it as mysterious. It is by a mediate creation through the parents that the soul is brought into existence. This alone accounts for

the great mental likeness which children bear to their parents and it alone accounts satisfactorily for original sin without making God its author. True, traducianism, does not lift the veil and show us the secret process by which the soul is prepared, nor does it claim to unravel what God has seen fit to hide from us. It simply asserts the fact and accepts it in spite of the mystery surrounding it. How soul can beget soul, is not as plain as how body can beget body; but the fact of its mysterious character does not disprove it. "The inscrutable mystery of the eternal generation of God's Son from the absolute Spirit, mirrors itself in the origin of the human soul." If Spirit begets Spirit in the Godhead, why should this be impossible among men, seeing that we were made in the likeness of God and are spirits. The Church accepts the eternal generation of the Son by the Father, but it makes no pretence to understand it. The mystery is incomprehensible. But as the image of God mirrors itself in the soul of man, so may the generation of the Son mirror itself in the traduction of the son through the father. Here man reaches the limits of his ability and must say to his proud reason: Thus far and no farther!

The chief Biblical arguments by which this theory is supported, are those given above in rebuttal of creationism. To these, others may be added. Acts 17, 26: "And hath made of one blood all the nations of men," etc.

Original: "And hath made of one", i. e. out of one man, "every nation of men" etc. The whole human family is thus derived from one man in whom it was potentially contained. It remains for others to prove that the soul is not included in this and that the reference is simply to the body. God made everything that is essential to man out of one man and this includes body and soul. The burden of proof falls upon those who deny this.

It must further be admitted that traducianism accords best with God's ordinary workings in nature and this would then afford an argument by analogy. Everywhere among the animate creatures it is a law that like begets like. Gen. 1, 11: "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself," etc. Also Gen. 1, 21. 24. Every herb and animal has the power of reproduction in itself, "after its

kind." The Creator out of existing matter produces new specimens which conform to the original type. The beasts of the field endowed with instinct produce after their kind. Gen. 1, 24. Here is not only matter from matter, but instinct from instinct. The offspring conforms to the original type. Why should the Creator be compelled in the reproduction of man to depart from His ordinary workings in nature? Why should the human species be an exception to the rule? It may be argued that the soul is not subject to the laws of matter. True; but it is a creature and therefore subject to the law of nature. Now if it multiplies at all, it will multiply after the ordinary law, "after its kind." Our dogmaticians have said: "As flame ignites flame, so soul begets soul." Without some very cogent reason for departing from the laws of nature, we must hold that God Himself adheres to them.

We may safely say that traducianism is the view held by the Lutheran Church, and by many of the fathers, such as Tertullian, Athanasius, and Gregory of Nyssa. The Formula of Concord teaches it: "*Deus non modo Adami et Evae corpus et animam ante lapsum, verum etiam corpora et animas nostras post lapsum creavit.*" Luther himself was not so decided in his views, yet he held traducianism. On this subject Chemnitz says: "Luther in his discussions concludes that he wishes to affirm nothing publicly concerning that question, but that he privately held the opinion of traduction. It is sufficient for us to know concerning the efficient cause, that our first parents by their fall merited that, such as they were after the fall both in body and mind, such also their posterity should be procreated. But how the soul contracts that sin we can safely remain in ignorance of, since the Holy Spirit has not been pleased to disclose this in certain and clear Scripture testimonies." Hutter also says: "In consequence of this disagreement among the Dogmaticians it has come to pass, even in our day, that there are not wanting theologians even of the highest rank who, in regard to this very question, would rather keep silent altogether, than to assert anything positively either within or beyond the express authority of Scripture." But he adds, also: "If any of our brethren should ask which opinion we think most accordant with

truth, we fearlessly answer that we precisely accord with the opinion of Luther, and hold it to be consonant with Scripture, namely, that the human soul is propagated by traduc-tion; so that just as everything else produces its like, a lion begetting a lion, a horse begetting a horse, so also man begets man, and not alone the flesh or the body, but also the soul is propagated as a real outgrowth from its parents." Quenstedt, John Gerhardt, Buddeus and, in fact, the leading theologians of the Lutheran Church have held this theory. John Gerhardt says: "The propagation of original sin shows, that human souls are not created immediately by God, but from the parents are propagated into the children." If men admit the existence of original sin, no matter how mysterious the "*modus propagationis animarum*" may be, they are irresistibly driven to accept traducianism.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH NOTES.

BY PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

THE ACTS OF PAUL.

An important find in New Testament literature has been made by the well known Coptic scholar Carl Schmidt, who a year ago gave to the learned world a gnostic work which had been used by Irenæus, which he found in the Coptic. The new discovery consists in a portion of the famous "Acts of St. Paul" (*πραξεις Παύλου*), which Eusebius, the historian, in h. e. III 3 places at the head of the New Testament Antilegomena-Notha, and even puts them between the Epistle to the Hebrews and Pastor Hermæ, as being on a parallel in authority with these. Together with four other ancient documents, namely the Apocalypse of Peter, the Pastor, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Acts of Paul are by Eusebius combined into a group of writings that are chronologically and in regard to intrinsic merit placed closest to the New Testament. Only a few years ago three of these writings were entirely unknown, one was known only in a translation and not in the original, and only one,

and that in part, merely, in the original. Now three of these are accessible in the original tongues, a fourth, namely the Apocalypse of Peter in satisfactory shape, and now the fifth has been revealed through the Coptic researches of Carl Schmidt, who has published his results in the *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, Vol. VII, 1897, pp. 117-124. We thus have now this entire group of five writings—although not absolutely complete—which were accustomed to be written in the same codices with the New Testament books.

Schmidt found this work in a collection of Coptic papyrus sheets, which had been partially examined in Cairo, but were not thoroughly studied until they were transferred to Heidelberg. The entire complex of papyri, written probably in the seventh century, is from one single hand, and, in a strange dialect, contains also among other things the story of an awakening from the dead and incidents in which Paul comes into contact with men with the names of Hermippus, Hermocrates and Dion. Then follow the Acts of Paul and of Thecla; secondly, the spurious correspondence between Paul and the Corinthians, and, thirdly, the Martyrium of Paul which was published by Lepsius in his *Acts App. Apocry.* I, pp. 104-117. Fortunately the final sheet has been preserved, containing the last words of the Martyrium, and also the words "Acts of Paul," together with an omission which, however, excludes the possibility that "Acta Thecla" had originally been added here.

Harnack, in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, No. 24, discusses this find, regarding it as an important discovery. On the basis for number of data, he concludes that all of these pieces originally belonged together and constituted the one writing of the Acts of Paul, this including also the Acts of Thecla. These are some events in Paul's career transpiring in Antiochia, Iconia, Corinth, Philippi and Rome. According to several ancient authorities, notably Hippolytus and Nicephorus, these Acts contained also experiences in Ephesus. They were modeled after the Canonical Acts and were probably about the size of this book. The present remnants contain in all only about 900 stichoi, or probably one-fourth of the entire work, but these are enough to judge of the character and trend of the book. The date of the whole is probaly somewhere between 120 and 170 A. D.

Harnack draws attention to an interesting problem connected with the study of these fragments. He draws attention to the extraordinary dignity accorded this book intrinsically of so little merit by the ancient church, until it was sharply attacked by Tertullian in his *De Baptismo*, and adds the following:

"One thing is certain. While in the last two or three decades discoveries and investigations have been made in great abundance that strengthened our faith in the ecclesiastical traditions of primitive Christianity and in the "tact" of the early church, the discovery of Schmidt has given this confidence a blow again. A large work, the "Acts of Paul," as found which—we can confidently claim—is nothing but a series of imaginary (*freier*) and novelistic inventions, based upon a very meagre substratum of facts. We need but read the *Martyrium of Paul*, which is absolutely devoid of real facts and appears to be full of fables throughout. And then this pseudo-correspondence between Paul and the Corinthians! This too was read and accepted without any criticism whatever. And who wrote the whole work? A presbyter of Asia Minor. And how was it received? Almost as equal to the Acts of St. Luke! It forces its way into Egypt, to Rome, to Carthage. It is regarded as an authoritative book. In Carthage the members of the congregation appeal to it as a question pertaining to Christ's disciples. The Roman Bishop Hippolytus considers it a trustworthy book. Origen cites it with respect. Tertullian has indeed from the very outset shown that it was a swindle, that a presbyter of Asia Minor had in it given the vaporings of an unbridled imagination 'and of love to Paul,' and that he had to confess to having fabricated the work and thereupon lost his position. But these discoveries of Tertullian are without effect, except possibly in Asia Minor and in Carthage. It is true that in the Occidental church the book has never gained the ascendancy it did in the East as a part of the Canon; but in Egypt it was highly regarded and takes its position at the head of this antilegomena, and for the whole church it furnishes the fable book of the Thecla stories for Syria and Armenia, and even for several Latin versions of the Bible, a third Epistle to the Corinthians!"

Over against this rather pessimistic view it must be remembered that Zahn, of Erlangen, an authority at least equal to Harnack, in his discussion of the matter in the December number of the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, sees no reasons whatever for drawing such conclusions. Besides, this book was never actually received into the canon anywhere in the church, so that Harnack's doubt as to the "tact" of the early church in selecting its sacred canon is without basis.

CONSERVATIVE CONCLUSION ON N. T. CANON.

Harnack, Adolf, in his *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius. 2. Teil: Die Chronologie. 1. Band. Die Chronologie der Litteratur bis Irenæus nebst einleitenden Untersuchungen.* Leipzig, 1897. J. C. Hinrichs, pp. XVI, 732 octavo, 26 marks.

It has secured this prominence because it is claimed to mark a new departure on the part of a representative leader of Biblical and historical criticism in the direction of conservative and traditional views in reference to the problems and perplexities of New Testament literature. While it is probable that conservative writers have overdrawn the importance of these conservative results and tendencies in Harnack's view, it is nevertheless certain that these are quite noteworthy and even extraordinary. There are no indications that the writer has broken with the principles and methods of current literary criticism of the sacred books, but he himself declares in his Vorrede—which is one of the most remarkable parts of the work—that he has reached "reactionary" results that go considerably beyond what can be called the golden middle (*mittleren Stand*) of modern criticism. He declares that the time is past when the older Christian literature, including that of the New Testament, can be considered as a tissue of deceptions and falsifications. This period, he says, was an episode for scientific research, from which much has been learned, but of which also much must be forgotten. Characteristic of the position of Harnack is the fact that he considers substantially the traditional background of the history of the New Testament writings as correct and reliable. In the entire New Testament he

finds but one absolutely pseudonymous work, namely II Peter, although others, such as the Pastoral Epistles, are indeed Pauline and genuine in their original forms, but have been interpolated later, however, in a not dangerous way or degree. It is not to be understood that Harnack shares in the traditional views concerning the origin of the disputed books of the New Testament canon. A glance at his Chronological Table, in which he gives a bird's-eye summary of his results, shows that on some leading subjects he still sides with the liberal writers. Indeed, the book is not at all to be regarded, and is not intended by the author to be a call for retreat on the part of critical research, but rather a call to more careful and conservative conclusions along the lines of critical investigation. Some of the dates of Harnack are a surprise. He places Paul's conversion as early as 30 A. D., and thus crowds the contents of the opening chapters of Acts into a very few months. Thessalonians he places at 48, 49; I Corinthians at 53 (52); II Corinthians at 53; Romans at 53, 54; the genuine writings underlying the Pastoral Epistles at 59-64; etc. He agrees with ancient criticism in assigning a relatively late date to the Gospels. Matthew is set at 70-75; Acts and Luke at 78-93; Mark at 65-70; the Gospel of John, the Presbyter John and the three Epistles of John no earlier than 80 and not after 110. He is very pronounced in his opinion that the traditions of early Christianity could and did concentrate and crystallize in the forms in which we have them in the Gospels within a much shorter time than is currently accepted in critical circles. He regards a period of thirty or forty years as long enough to explain the formation of historical data such as we have in the Synoptic Gospels, and a period of thirty to forty years after Paul is sufficient to explain as a phenomenon of history the advance of thought represented by the Fourth Gospel beyond and above that found in the Epistles of that great apostle. As a historical parallel he draws attention to the phenomenal development during the few years that followed the beginnings of Luther's work in 1517.

That Harnack is not to be regarded as a convert to conservatism, however satisfactory the conservative tendency and results of this book may be, can be seen from the

entire conception of New Testament literature which underlies the whole work. A general difference between these and other books of early Christian literature he seemingly does not recognize. His object is to mark in detail the exact position of each specimen of primitive Christian literature, whether Biblical or un-Biblical, and to assign to it its proper place in the historical development of the thought and life of the church. If he recognizes the powers of other factors and forces in the production of the New Testament writings that he discovers also the rest of this literature, he certainly does not make note of it in a manner that would satisfy a conservative thinker. Harnack's work is still marked by the characteristics of a product of the critical school; but it represents the phase of sobered and careful criticism. While not the last word on the subject of New Testament literature, it is nevertheless a masterly production and a book for the student.

POINTS IN PAULINE THEOLOGY.

What does Paul mean by the technical term πίστις Χριστοῦ? Modern commentators as a rule agree to disagree on the exact origin and interpretation of this expression, although the current solution makes it equivalent to πίστις εἰς Χριστόν, which would make the second word the objective genitive, the purpose being to show that Christian faith is built upon Christ as its foundation. Considerable dissatisfaction with this solution has been repeatedly expressed, notably by Zahn, in his "Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche", by Cremer, and others. In the "Greifswalder Studien", a collection of special biblical and theological research essays published in honor of the twenty-fifth jubilee of Professor Cremer, of Greifswald, Dr. Hausleiter, a member of the same faculty, publishes a special and systematic examination of this expression, in which quite a different view is taken. He regards the genitive as that of origin or source, and the expression to signify the faith that originates in Christ, that is effected and caused by Him, and the rendering "faith in Christ" accordingly incorrect, while "faith into Christ" would substantially express the idea more correctly.

In reaching this conclusion the author proceeds from the underlying Pauline expression *πιστεύεις εἰς Χριστόν*, which verbal contraction is used only and alone when "Christ" is the object; when the object is "God", the preposition *ἐπὶ* is used with this verb. But as this construction in turn is peculiarly a New Testament idiom, and found not even in the Septuagint, he resorts to the parallel expression *βαπτίζεν εἰς Χριστόν*, in order to determine the meaning of the preceding. This expression is shown to mean baptized on the basis of Christ so that thereby a communion or unio mystica, in the old dogmatical sense of the word is expressed. As Lipsius says: One and the same result is effected, namely the mystic union with Christ, objectively through baptism, subjectively through faith. The verbal construction furnishes the basis for the nominal *πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ*, which represents the state brought about by the faith based on Christ and derived from Him. The equivalent of these terms is now the third, namely *πίστις Χριστοῦ*, which, *mutatis mutandis*, is the exact counterpart of *πιστεύεις εἰς Χριστόν*. This genitive originis the author finds also in other constructions not generally connected with it, thus, in Gal. 1, 7, "the Gospel of Christ", i. e. the Gospel first preached by Christ, originating in Him, cf. also Rom. 16, 25; 1 Cor. 1, 6; Col. 3, 16. How careful we must be before we accept objective genetives in Paul's writings can be seen from examples like "the Love of God" in Rom. 5, 5, or "Love of Christ." Rom. 8, 35; 2 Cor. 5, 14; Eph. 3, 19. The one seeming exception to Hausleiter's interpretation is Col. 2, 5, but this is fully explained by the context. The writer brings his interpretation of this peculiar expression in close connection with the whole Pauline system of justification and salvation, especially in its practical bearings, in so far as by faith the Christian is actually in communion with his Savior. Naturally he refers to all the leading recent works on the subject, and among others mentions with special words of commendation the English commentary on Romans by Sanloy and Headlam. Hausleiter's essays is an excellent production.

The same volume contains two other contributions to Pauline theology based on an analysis of special terms and verses. One is by Professor Luetgarts, a very promising conservative scholar, on the term *ἀνθρῶπος ἐξ ὁρᾶν* in

1 Cor. 15, 47, in which the current interpretation, according to which merely the pre-existence of Christ is implied is modified by showing that the chronological contents of this expression are much deeper especially as far as the divinity of Christ's origin and character are concerned. "Paul does not represent the Son of God as pre-existing as man, but as in His divine nature (gottheitlich); and he does not picture this heavenly origin as merely a beginning in time of His earthly existence, but as the abiding and permanent basis thereof, and his entrance into the world then not as a laying aside of His heavenly mode of existence." The essay is thus substantially an exegetical argument against the Kenosis doctrine.

Dr. Schaeder analyzes the thought of Phil. 2, 12, 13, and finds therein a golden middle between the rival interpretations of Calvinistic determinism on the one hand and all kinds of Synergism on the other.

DEFENDER OF MOSES.

The number of those who defend the absolute or Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the historical character of the contents of these books, is steadily increasing among the Germans. The latest addition to these ranks is Pastor George Stosch, of Berlin, who is publishing a series of *Alttestamentliche Studien*, of which two have been issued, the purpose of the series being the defence of traditional views. The first of these studies discusses the origin of Genesis (2 marks); the second, Moses and the Document of the Exodus (2 marks). The series is published by the well known conservative publishing house of Bertelsmann, of Gütersloh. In the first study the author aimed to demonstrate that Genesis is a compilation from a series of documents written before the days of Moses, penned by the chief actors of the history of God's kingdom themselves, and containing the record of God's revelation to these men, from Adam to Joseph. In the second study the writer endeavors to prove that Moses himself was the author of the narratives recorded in reference to the Exodus, the leading thought of the argument being, that only a person of such grand personality as

was the bearer of the message from Sinai could be regarded as the author of the account given concerning the origin of the Law. He says: "He who was called to continue the development of God's kingdom was also called and in duty bound to continue sacred historiography."

IT is a significant fact that the religion — perhaps we might better say the denominationalism — of kings is a most uncertain quantity: and it is also true that however great the spiritual authority of the Papacy over the masses, its hold upon present-day royalty is exceedingly slight. In a late issue of the *London Spectator* editorial comment is made upon the recent losses of the Roman Catholic Church among crowned heads, and upon the singular indifference of European sovereigns in general to the claims of that creed. Thus, within the last few years, Rome has gained only one small throne, Roumania; it has lost the Bourbon thrones of France and Naples and the Braganza throne of Brazil. The Kings of Saxony and Bavaria have ceased to be completely independent in the matter of their allegiance to the Pope; the Prince of Bulgaria, a king in all but name, has allowed his son to be brought up as a heretic. Only two monarchs of first-class States, Austria and Italy, are now Catholic, and one of these has remained excommunicated for two generations. No Catholic ecclesiastic is now a sovereign prince, actually ruling in his territory; no government, excepting, perhaps, that of Ecuador, maintains laws completely in accord with the ideas and wishes of the Holy See. The rulers of Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Bavaria, Saxony, and Roumania, acknowledge the authority of St. Peter, but they are rivaled or outweighed by the princes of Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Wurtemberg, Hesse, Baden, Greece, Servia, and Montenegro. Of the great powers, Great Britain and Germany are Protestant, while Russia's allegiance is to the Greek Church.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XVIII.

APRIL, 1898.

No. 2.

OF THE TWO NATURES IN CHRIST.

BY MARTIN CHEMNITZ.

Translated from the Latin by Rev. Prof. A. Pfueger, A. M., Columbus, O.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE EXPLANATION OF THE TERMS ESSENCE, PERSON,
ABSTRACT, CONCRETE, ATTRIBUTES, ETC.

The Athanasian Symbol rightly and duly admonishes us so to think and speak of Christ that we may neither confound the natures nor divide the person. And John of Damascus adds, book 5, chapter 5, "This leads the heretics into error, that they do not distinguish or discern between the Essence and the Person." In order, therefore, that our explanation of matters according to the foundation of the Scriptures may be clearer and easier, we shall in the outset explain certain general terms whose value in this doctrine is great.

The synonyms, then, according to the usage of the ancient Church, that John of Damascus reports to have been used for the same purpose, are *οὐσίαν, φύσιν καὶ μορφήν*, essence or substance, nature and form; that is, that which of itself is common to many individuals of the same species and which embraces the entire essential perfection of each. Thus in the language of the Church at the present (for I shall not here repeat the controversies of former times concerning these terms) the synonyms are: *ὁφιστάμενον, ἐπόστασις, πρόσωπον, καὶ ἄτομον*, subsisting, substance, person and individual; that is, a pe-

Vol. XIII—5.

culiar something which indeed has the entire and perfect substance of the same species, but also certain characteristics, and is determined or limited by a personal quality which the Scholastics call the individualizing principle, and thus, being separated or distinct from the other individuals of the same nature, not essentially but numerically, subsists for itself. For a person, as usually defined, is an individual substance, intelligent, incommunicable, which is neither a part of another nor sustained in another, nor having a dependence upon another, as has the departed soul on the body that is to be raised. Thus, therefore, the names of the essence or natures are: θεότης, ἀνθρωπότης, deity, humanity; the divine nature, the human nature; the divine essence, the human substance. The appellations of the person are: God, Man, Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity, the Son of God, the Son of man, Christ, etc.

But it is to be observed, as John of Damascus remarks, book 1, chapter 11, that in creatures the common essence is considered not in fact as subsisting for itself, but λόγῳ καὶ ἐπινούῳ, logically and in thought; whereas persons are considered in fact and subsist separately and differ numerically. But in the Godhead the nature or the common essence is not something imaginary or merely cogitated by the reasoning faculty, or a unit in appearance only; on the contrary, the Divinity is most simple and numerically one, which, nevertheless, is communicable and common to the three persons and entire in each; so that, as Augustine says, there is in each person of the Trinity not ὁμοιότης, a similarity, but ταυτότης, an identity of essence. The divine essence is predicated of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, not as a genus of its species, nor as a species of its individuals, nor as a whole of its parts, but in a certain other ineffable and incomprehensible manner the Hypostases indeed or persons of the Trinity are all one on account of the identity of essence, and therefore they do not differ essentially, nor does one subsist apart from the other and without the other. "For the Father is in me and I am in the Father," says the Son. Again, "I am not alone, because the Father is with me." But relatively or τρόπῳ ὁπάρξεως, in their mode of subsisting, they really differ; namely, because the Father is not begotten, the Son is

begotten, the Holy Spirit proceeds: that is, the Father, being not begotten, has of Himself that most simple, unique and identical essence of the Trinity, of which from eternity He begot His coeternal Son; the Son has that same essence by His being begotten, or γεννητῶς, as John of Damascus says, being begotten of the Father from eternity; the Holy Spirit has that same essence by proceeding, as He proceeds from the Father and the Son from eternity. For these are the characteristic attributes, as the old Greeks call them, that is, as it were, characters, signs or marks, by which the persons of the Trinity, although they are one in essence and each person is the entire divine essence, differ from each other and are distinguished. From this consideration of the essence or nature John of Damascus, book 3, chapter 11, correctly points out that the Logos assumed a human nature not as considered in thought merely according to the common notion of it and abstracted in thought from all individuals, no reference being had to the individuals under it. For thus there would be no incarnation, but a fancy of the reasoning faculty and a deception. Nor is it considered as in a species. For not in all the persons (hypostases), that is, not in all the individuals of mankind did the Logos assume a human nature: but He assumed a human nature considered in one certain individual mass, separated from others by special properties; not that it was an individual subsisting for itself before it was assumed, but that it subsists in a peculiar way in the person of the Logos by the union of assumption, as will hereafter be explained.

In the same manner the divine nature did not absolutely, so far as it is common to the three persons of the Godhead, but relatively, so far as it is considered in the person of the Son, assume the human; for not the entire Trinity, nor the Father or the Holy Spirit, but only the Son became incarnate. Hence the language of the Church properly speaks thus: That the divine essence or divine nature of the Logos is personally united with the assumed human nature; that is, the divine nature considered in the person of the Son, or so far as the essence of the Godhead or that common nature is limited or determined by a characteristic, particular, singular and personal quality or mode of subsisting in the person of the Son, (as one of the ancients,

Longobardus, says) assumed the human nature. For the Son has the divine nature by His having been begotten or γεννητῶς, that is, after the manner of generation, as begotten of the Father, as Augustine says. But the Father has it of Himself as the unbegotten. The Holy Spirit has it ἐκπορευτῶς, by procession, namely, because He was not begotten, but proceeded from eternity from the Father and the Son. And thus, although not the whole Trinity, nor the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, but only the Son became incarnate, nevertheless the whole, entire and perfect divine essence or nature, as Dionysius says, is united in one of its persons—namely, in the person of the Son—with the assumed human nature. We shall hereafter have use for these statements concerning the said terms.

John of Damascus also applies the terms ἀνυπόστατον καὶ ἐνυπόστατον to this doctrine. For although otherwise ἀνυπόστατον signifies that which does not exist at all, and ἐνυπόστατον that which either exists in itself or inheres in another, as an attribute in a subject, nevertheless he of Damascus properly thinks that the human nature in Christ can be called ἀνυπόστατον, namely, because in itself and according to itself alone in its own personality, as the Scholastics say, it does not subsist, but is ἐνυπόστατος; that is, it subsists in another, namely, in the person of the Logos, which has been made its person.

Furthermore, some brief remarks should be made here respecting the terms abstract and concrete. For they are not always and by all used in one and the same signification, but the first use of them is the Scholastic. For since, as has already been said and will hereafter be more fully explained, in the incarnate Christ nature and person are not the same, it is necessary, in order to avoid both confusion and division, to have certain distinct terms which signify the natures in Christ and others which denote His person. But those different or distinct terms the Scholastic writers wished to indicate and distinguish in this doctrine by means of peculiar appellations used as signs. The terms, therefore, which denote the natures themselves in Christ they call abstract terms. And when in any discourse or proposition they use terms which signify the natures themselves as united in the person of Christ, this the Scholastics

call "speaking in the abstract" or "speaking by means of abstract terms." And they call those *abstractive* propositions which consist of abstract terms, that is, those signifying or denoting the natures themselves in Christ. Those terms, however, they call concrete which signify and denote the person of Christ subsisting in two natures or consisting of two natures. Thus to say something in the concrete is, according to the Scholastics, when something is attributed to the person itself by means of personal terms; and to speak by means of concrete terms is when we use appellations denoting the person itself of Christ. They also call those propositions *concretive* which consist of terms signifying Christ's person itself. For it is a general rule among the Scholastic writers that abstract terms stand for the natures, the concrete for the person; and the abstract terms for the divine nature are: Deity, divinity, divine essence, etc. The abstract terms for the human nature are: humanity, the human substance or nature, flesh, blood, etc. They say that the concrete terms for the divine nature are: God, Logos, Son of God, etc.; and the concrete terms for the human nature are: man, Son of man, Son of Mary, etc.; while the concrete terms for both natures are: Christ, Immanuel, etc. Thus Luther, in commenting on the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, says: The human nature of Christ in the concrete is man. These Scholastic notations, because they point out the difference of appellations, by means of the terms abstract and concrete, when either the natures themselves in Christ are to be distinctly considered or when the person itself subsisting in two natures is to be understood,—are properly and usefully retained in the schools among the learned in treating of this doctrine, in order that a confusion of the natures may be the more easily avoided, and the unity of the person, together with the difference of the natures, may in our speaking be conserved, and that it may be clearly determined as to what are the attributes of each nature and how they are communicated to the person. And further as to what the assumed nature in Christ has received, besides the physical properties, from its hypostatic union with His divinity; as when we say in the schools that not only in the concrete or by means of a concrete term signifying the person is it correct to say that Christ is man or that

the Son of man gives life, but also in the abstract or by means of an abstract term it is correct to say of the assumed nature united with the Logos that the flesh of Christ united with the Logos gives life, the blood of Christ cleanses from sin; so that it may be indicated that not only to the person according to the divine nature, but also to the assumed nature itself, on account of its hypostatic union with the divine, or to the person according to the human nature also, these things are correctly attributed, not through a formal inhesion but through an intimate union, as in red-hot iron, as these things will hereafter be explained. Hence Luther says that God Himself brought it about that certain terms are called *abstract* and certain others *concrete*, as hereafter in our explanation of matters these things shall be made clear by means of examples.

Then, to be sure, there is another signification and another use of these terms, according to their grammatical or etymological relation, when they are inserted into the propositions themselves so as to limit either the subject or the predicate; as when I say, one nature of Christ is considered in the abstract; again, the human nature of Christ has received something in the abstract, has something in the abstract, something has been given to it or communicated to it in the abstract; for it is not correct to say: The flesh of Christ gives life in the abstract, or it is to be adored in the abstract; for then nature is understood as to what it is and what it has if it be considered *per se*, for itself, in itself and separately, or in its natural constitution, or as to what spiritual gifts, besides its physical condition, it has in and for itself received and holds as inhering in it formally, habitually and subjectively. It is understood also that the human nature is considered in the abstract, if it is taken *ἡσυχῶς καὶ ἐκτενῶς*, as John of Damascus says, that is, if you separate it by subtle thinking from the divine, and you consider it as if it were left to itself outside the union (for in reality these two united natures are not separated to all eternity). In this sense Luther writes on Isaiah, chapter 59, concerning the separated divinity and the separated humanity, or as placed apart by itself, and adds: This ought not to be done, for the abstracts ought not to be separated, otherwise our faith is false; but we must believe in the concrete that

this Man is God. Again, in this passage we must say nothing at all concerning the abstract, because faith teaches us that here there is no abstract but a concretion, a conjunction and a copulation of the two natures. Again, Christ is Lord of the angels even according to His human nature, but only according to the concretion; that is, in the hypostatic union and by reason of the union in His person. This signification of the word *abstract* is taken from physical materials. For when a subject is considered at the same time with its adjunct, as a white wall, a sick body, or one affected with a disease, then it is called a concrete. But when the subject is considered separately and for itself and the adjunct, as whiteness, sickness, is also considered separately for itself, either in the subject itself or abstracted from the subject in thought, as the mind carries about a cognition of it apart from any consideration of the subject,—then it is called an abstract.

Moreover, because the use of such Scholastic terms in this doctrine has been invented and received, to the end that the things themselves may not be confused and obscured, but distinguished and explained; therefore in the using of Scholastic terms of this kind those do right who add a distinction and a declaration as to how and in what signification they wish these words to be received and understood, since they are not always used in one and the same way. Those, however, do wrong who, although there is agreement and harmony in regard to the things themselves, still disturb the churches on account of these Scholastic or technical terms which one man uses and accepts in one sense and another in another. But the snares of those who, under the pretext of such terms, attempt to bring in and to obtrude upon the Church a corruption of the doctrine itself, must be both uncovered and avoided; as if any one should say: In the concrete it is indeed correct to say that the Son of man or the man Christ gives life, but that it is not correct to say in the abstract, or by means of an abstract term, of the assumed nature as it is united with the Logos, that the flesh of Christ gives life, the blood of Christ cleanses, or Christ gives life by means of His flesh and cleanses with His blood; for there a snare lies concealed. I shall hereafter have great use for these observations in the complete

explanation of this doctrine, but in this chapter I wished only to explain and differentiate the terms in a brief manner.

The terms properties or attributes must also be explained in this connection. As synonyms, however, we have: *ιδιότης καὶ ἰδίωμα*, property *διαφορὰ*, difference, *ἰδίωμα χαρακτηριστικόν*, *ιδιάζον*, characteristic attribute which constitute and designate something peculiar as with a sign or mark: often also the word *ποιότης*, quality, is so used. For because there is not an identity or equality but a diversity and a difference between the two natures united in the person of Christ, that thing, be it essential or accidental, by which one nature differs from the other and this person differs from other persons of the same nature, is called an attribute and a difference. And because attributes do not depart from their subjects, therefore in Christ the physical or essential attribute of one nature neither is nor can it become the essential or physical attribute of the other nature; for else there would be a confusion of natures which differ and are discerned through their attributes, as John of Damascus in some places repeats the rule: *ἡ γὰρ ἰδιότης ἀκίνητος, ἥ πῶς ἂν ἰδιότης μένοι ζινοῦμένη ἢ μεταπίπτουσα*, the attribute is immovable, or how could it remain an attribute, if either it should be moved from one subject into another, or if it should fall away? That is to say, when a common attribute passes out, so that, namely, it becomes equally the property of this and also of the other nature, or if it is abolished, then it ceases to be an attribute, and the things which are discerned through the attributes will no longer be different, but are rendered either identical or equal. An essential attribute, therefore, of the divine nature never becomes an essential attribute of the human nature and vice versa. But how nevertheless there is brought about a true communication of attributes in the union, just as the soul communicates its vital and living powers and operations to its animate body and as fire truly and really communicates to heated iron the power of shining and burning, although the former nevertheless are and remain the attributes of the soul alone and the latter those of the fire alone and do not become the essential properties of either the body or the iron,—this will hereafter be explained.

The attributes, however, are either essential or accidental or personal. Of the essential some are *ιδιώματα συστατικά τῶν φύσεων*, constitutive of the natures, which constitute the natures themselves or which pertain to the constitution of the essence, as in the divine nature all the attributes are essential which are not something distinct and diverse from the essence of God itself. For if the divine *οὐσία* or essence were completed by something else differing from itself, that is, rendered better, more blessed and more perfect, then it would not be an altogether simple essence nor would it be the highest and most perfect good. The divine essence, therefore, is powerful and wise, not by a power or a wisdom which is something distinct, like a quality, from the essence, but it is in itself omnipotence, wisdom, goodness, etc. But the attributes of the human nature are *συστατικά* because it consists of a body and a soul: because the soul is a spirit created, rational, immortal, and essential part of human nature; because the body is a creature consisting of flesh, blood, skin, bones, nerves, and arranged according to a certain symmetry of the members. Of those attributes which are constitutive of the natures John of Damascus correctly says that without them nature, essence and species could not in any-wise exist. But other essential or natural attributes he calls, book 1, chapters 4 and 12, *τὰ περὶ τὴν φύσιν*, which are around the nature, or *περιπέρισμα τῇ φύσει*, which are consequent upon the constitution of nature or the constituted nature; as in the human nature, because by its natural condition it is visible, palpable, circumscribed by its physical location in one place, etc. For what divine omnipotence is able to do in these physical attributes will afterwards be shown. We also speak of accidental attributes and infirmities which are imposed upon human nature on account of sin and which Christ in His state of humiliation willingly and without sin assumed, not by the necessity of His nature, but that He might be an offering for ourselves. And in the Scholastic system the remaining created gifts and qualities or preternatural powers with which the human nature of Christ is furnished formally, habitually and subjectively, are called accidental properties. For even without these the human nature is able to have and to retain its appearance, and it

has them not by its natural constitution but from some other source. The personal attributes are those which distinguish the person of the Logos from the other persons of the Trinity, namely, that He is the Son, the Logos, the Only Begotten of the Father, the Second Person of the Trinity, who is personally united to the human nature. Again, 1 Cor. 1, He is called the power and wisdom of God, not unbegotten, as it is in the Father, nor proceeding, as it is in the Holy Spirit, but *begotten*; for this is the characteristic attribute by which the common divine essence in the person of the Son is defined and determined. Thus the entire fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily in the assumed human nature, not under the person of the Father or of the Holy Spirit, but in and under the person of the Son alone. Thus also there are quasi personal attributes of the human nature in Christ, although it does not subsist of itself and separately, because this mass or this individual of the human nature subsisting in the person of the Logos differs from all other persons of human nature; namely, because it does not subsist in itself but in the person of the Logos: for, destitute of a personality of its own, it has the person of the Logos for its person, because it belongs to the very person of the incarnate Son, together with which it is a synthetic (σύνθετος) person, as Nazianzen says. And this mass alone or this individual alone of human nature, personally united with the divine nature of the Logos, has been exalted above all creatures to the right hand of the majesty and omnipotence of God.

But all the power which has been given to Christ in time according to the human nature—the universal dominion over all things, the power of giving life, by which the flesh of Christ was made alive—cannot correctly, properly and suitably be called an attribute of the human nature. For it is and remains an essential attribute of the divine nature of the Logos, but it is communicated to the human nature of Christ by the economy of the union, as the power of glowing and burning is communicated to the heated iron, not formally, nor habitually, nor subjectively, as we shall hereafter explain. I would therefore have the learned piously reflect on the peculiar and distinct appellation of those things which are in this manner communicated to the

assumed nature, as I shall afterwards in their proper place cite certain appellations used by the ancients. Of the other terms, however, which are used in the explanation of this doctrine we shall speak at the proper time. Here at the outset I wished to explain the more common terms only. Let us now therefore proceed to the explanation of the things themselves.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE DIVINE NATURE IN THE INCARNATE CHRIST.

Because the person of the incarnate Christ consists of two natures, the divine and the human, united into one hypostasis, there results thence the communication of attributes. The doctrine of the hypostatic union of the two natures and of the communication of attributes in Christ cannot be correctly and explicitly set forth unless we first treat of the natures themselves. We shall, therefore, in the first place, state the true import of the Scriptures concerning the divine nature in Christ, briefly set free from the evident antithesis of corrupt opinions.

For the old serpent, which knew and feared that its head would be bruised by the power of the divine nature through the seed of the woman, has attempted by means of various artifices to deprave and elude the doctrine of the divine nature in Christ, and especially withal after it had received and felt that deadly blow on its head in the passion and resurrection of Christ. For not a mere man by means of some human or created force, but the divine power of the Logos itself bruised the serpent's head through the assumed human nature.

But in order that we may briefly and compendiously grasp the monsters of various heresies and by way of premonition the more suitably oppose to them the true meaning of the Scriptures, we shall not, as is usually done in the catalogues of heretics, recite the names and opinions of the individual heretics in the order of their time, but we shall bring them together in a brief summary and show how the prince of this world has drawn up, as it were, especially three battle lines for the purpose of assailing the divine nature in Christ, and shall demonstrate how the true sense

taken from the foundation of Holy Writ can and should be opposed to each, so that our faith may separate itself from all false opinions.

Cerinthus, then, and Ebion, together with their followers, taught that the person of Christ did not exist before Mary, but that His entire substance and person first began when in the fulness of time He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin Mary, as a pure man merely and consisting of a human nature only, who has been called God for the reason that in His human nature only He was furnished and perfected before all other men with the excellence of divine gifts and heavenly virtues. Thus Augustine says, book 8, Conf. c. 19: I used to know only that Christ is preferred before others by reason of a certain great excellence of His human nature and the perfection of His wisdom; I did not understand that the Word was made flesh.

And according to Athanasius Photinus blasphemously says that Christ on account of the merit of His holy conversation was endowed with the special honor of divinity and grew to be God by reason of His actions. Certain Anabaptists also and the Antitrinitarians of our time think that Christ is only a man, but is called God not by reason of His divine nature personally united with the human, but by reason of the excellence of His divine office and gifts; just as magistrates are called gods, and as Moses is called the God of Aaron. But all these deny that the person of Christ consists of two natures; for they ascribe to Him a human nature only, but the divine, by reason and in respect of which He is God and was before Mary from all eternity, they strip from Him.

In the second place, the Carpocratians and those who follow Basil concede indeed that in Christ incarnate there is, besides the human nature, a certain other heavenly nature, but they blasphemously say that it is not of the same essence with God the Father and Creator, but is of another kind of substance and power. From these embers Arius afterwards enkindled the flames of his blasphemy.

In the third place, the Praxeans, Sabellians and Noetians recognized in Christ a true divine nature; but because they taught that there is only one person in the Godhead, they said that God the Father Himself became in-

carnate, was crucified, etc. Hence they were called Patri-passians.

These are the chief and summary heads of the controversies by means of which the heretics assailed the verity of the divine nature in Christ. For as to the remainder, namely, in regard to the indwelling of the Godhead in Christ as in the saints, and that at the time of His humiliation the Godhead was not present with Him, but then at length descended into Him when the dove remained upon Him and gave the sign, but which at the time of His passion departed from Him again, as Cerinthus taught: these pertain to the chapter respecting the hypostatic union and the humiliation.

There is, however, a true doctrine concerning the divine nature in Christ revealed and handed down by means of the certain and illustrious testimonies of Holy Writ, some of which it will always profit us to have at hand and in sight, so that they may be urged against the falsification of the fanatics, both ancient and modern, in such a way that we may separate ourselves from all the byways of error and continue in the simple or royal way of the true doctrine divinely revealed, Christ guiding us by His Spirit. And these testimonies can conveniently be arranged in the same way as we have described the controversies.

For, first, that Christ consists not only of a human but also of a divine nature and that His person existed before He was conceived and born of Mary according to the human nature, He Himself manifestly testifies, John 8: "Before Abraham was I am"; and John 17 He asserts that He had glory with the Father before the foundation of the world. Paul affirms, 1 Cor. 10, that it was Christ who led the children of Israel through the desert. And in the Prophets, more especially in the Psalms, Christ is very frequently spoken of before His assumption of the flesh. Hence Irenæus says, book 3, chapter 18, and book 4, chapter 14, that the Logos, who afterwards assumed the seed of Abraham, was always present with the human race from the beginning and spoke to the fathers. John the Baptist exclaims: "He was before me," who (namely, Christ) nevertheless was conceived after him. Yea, that He was from eternity before the human race and before every creature, John most clearly affirms in the first chapter of his gospel.

taken from the foundation of Holy Writ can and should be opposed to each, so that our faith may separate itself from all false opinions.

Cerinthus, then, and Ebion, together with their followers, taught that the person of Christ did not exist before Mary, but that His entire substance and person first began when in the fulness of time He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin Mary, as a pure man merely and consisting of a human nature only, who has been called God for the reason that in His human nature only He was furnished and perfected before all other men with the excellence of divine gifts and heavenly virtues. Thus Augustine says, book 8, Conf. c. 19: I used to know only that Christ is preferred before others by reason of a certain great excellence of His human nature and the perfection of His wisdom; I did not understand that the Word was made flesh.

And according to Athanasius Photinus blasphemously says that Christ on account of the merit of His holy conversation was endowed with the special honor of divinity and grew to be God by reason of His actions. Certain Anabaptists also and the Antitrinitarians of our time think that Christ is only a man, but is called God not by reason of His divine nature personally united with the human, but by reason of the excellence of His divine office and gifts; just as magistrates are called gods, and as Moses is called the God of Aaron. But all these deny that the person of Christ consists of two natures; for they ascribe to Him a human nature only, but the divine, by reason and in respect of which He is God and was before Mary from all eternity, they strip from Him.

In the second place, the Carpocratians and those who follow Basil concede indeed that in Christ incarnate there is, besides the human nature, a certain other heavenly nature, but they blasphemously say that it is not of the same essence with God the Father and Creator, but is of another kind of substance and power. From these embers Arius afterwards enkindled the flames of his blasphemy.

In the third place, the Praxeans, Sabellians and Noetians recognized in Christ a true divine nature; but because they taught that there is only one person in the Godhead, they said that God the Father Himself became in-

carnate, was crucified, etc. Hence they were called Patri-passians.

These are the chief and summary heads of the controversies by means of which the heretics assailed the verity of the divine nature in Christ. For as to the remainder, namely, in regard to the indwelling of the Godhead in Christ as in the saints, and that at the time of His humiliation the Godhead was not present with Him, but then at length descended into Him when the dove remained upon Him and gave the sign, but which at the time of His passion departed from Him again, as Cerinthus taught: these pertain to the chapter respecting the hypostatic union and the humiliation.

There is, however, a true doctrine concerning the divine nature in Christ revealed and handed down by means of the certain and illustrious testimonies of Holy Writ, some of which it will always profit us to have at hand and in sight, so that they may be urged against the falsification of the fanatics, both ancient and modern, in such a way that we may separate ourselves from all the byways of error and continue in the simple or royal way of the true doctrine divinely revealed, Christ guiding us by His Spirit. And these testimonies can conveniently be arranged in the same way as we have described the controversies.

For, first, that Christ consists not only of a human but also of a divine nature and that His person existed before He was conceived and born of Mary according to the human nature, He Himself manifestly testifies, John 8: "Before Abraham was I am"; and John 17 He asserts that He had glory with the Father before the foundation of the world. Paul affirms, 1 Cor. 10, that it was Christ who led the children of Israel through the desert. And in the Prophets, more especially in the Psalms, Christ is very frequently spoken of before His assumption of the flesh. Hence Irenæus says, book 3, chapter 18, and book 4, chapter 14, that the Logos, who afterwards assumed the seed of Abraham, was always present with the human race from the beginning and spoke to the fathers. John the Baptist exclaims: "He was before me," who (namely, Christ) nevertheless was conceived after him. Yea, that He was from eternity before the human race and before every creature, John most clearly affirms in the first chapter of his gospel.

The Word which afterwards was made flesh was in the beginning. Hebrews 1: "By whom also He made the worlds." Christ says, Rev. 1: "I am the First and the Last." Col. 1: "By Him were all things created," "And He is before all things." Heb. 13: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday and to-day and forever." But because the human nature of Christ in the fulness of time took its beginning from the virgin Mary, it is necessary to say that there is in Him also another nature which was before Abraham and before all: yea, before the foundation of the world, even from eternity, as the Scriptures very clearly describe the two natures in Christ, naming the Logos and the flesh in John 1; Man and God, in John 10, and Matt. 16. Jer. 23 He is called the Branch of David and the Lord our Righteousness. Isaiah 9 He is called Immanuel, the Lord with us. And Rom. 9: Christ according to the flesh is of the fathers, who is God blessed forever. 1 Tim. 3: God manifest in the flesh.

Secondly, that that other nature of Christ, besides the human, is the true and eternal divine essence, not some other different spiritual or heavenly substance, nature or power, the Scriptures plainly testify. 1 John 5: "He is the true God." John 16: "All things that the Father hath are Mine." John 10: "I and the Father are one." John 14: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me?" Col. 2: "In Him (Christ) dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

Thirdly, there are manifest testimonies in Scripture that not the whole Trinity, that is, that not all three persons of the Godhead at once, nor the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, but only the Son assumed the flesh. For Gabriel, Luke 1, does indeed attribute the bringing about of the incarnation to the whole Trinity: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." John 1: The Word which was made flesh was with God, that is, the only begotten Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father. Gal. 4: "God sent His Son, made of a woman." Matt. 16: The Son of man is the Son of the living God. Heb. 9:

Christ offered Himself to God through the eternal Spirit. Luke 3: The Son of God stood in the assumed flesh on the bank of the Jordan, the Holy Spirit descended upon Him in a bodily form, and the voice of the Father was heard from above: This is My Son.

John of Damascus, book 3, chapter 6, cites the saying of Dionysius: θεότης ὀλιχῶς ὁμῖν ἐν μία τῶν ἐαυτῆς ἐχοινώνησε ὑποστάσεων. This John thus explains: We say that the entire and perfect substance of the Godhead was made incarnate in one of its persons; for the same substance of the Godhead is entire and perfect in each of the persons. And when we say that the Godhead is united with the flesh we understand that which Athanasius and Cyril say: τὴν φύσιν τοῦ λόγου σεσαρχῶσθαι, the substance of the Word became incarnate. Thus says John of Damascus, who repeats this proposition in several places: In no way did the Father and the Holy Spirit communicate to the incarnation of God the Word except according to their good pleasure and will.

Augustine says in reference to faith, ad Petrum, chapter 13: Believe most firmly that one person of the Trinity, that is, God the Son, when He took the form of a servant, was conceived in a virgin and born of a virgin.

In his *Enchiridion*, chapter 38, he says: The entire Trinity made that Creature which the virgin conceived and brought forth, although it belongs to the person of the Son alone. In his work on Ecclesiastical Dogmas, chapter 2, he writes: The Father did not assume flesh, nor the Holy Spirit, but only the Son.

Maxentius cites from Proclus: Mary bore, not the Trinity, but one of the Trinity.

And the Decrees of the Council of Toledo, which Longobardus describes, book 3, dist. 5, are to the same effect: The Word alone was made flesh. Although the entire Trinity brought about the formation of the conceived man, since the works of the Trinity are inseparable, nevertheless the Son alone received man into the unity of His person, not into the unity of the divine essence, that is, the humanity is something peculiar to the Son, not something common to the Trinity.

This proposition, which was not handed down with sufficient explanation, since it had in former times brought forth various disputations, Longobardus correctly explains thus: The divine nature united with itself a human nature, not in the three persons in common, but strictly in the person of the Son, as if three maidens were to put a tunic on one of their number: a similitude which the Scholastics use.

But from this Toledo Canon falsely understood certain recent sciolists, in order to overthrow the real communication of attributes—which will hereafter be explained in its proper place—have begun to spread abroad their notions and to dispute thus: Since the divine essence or nature is common to the entire Trinity, that is, belongs to the same time and in common to all three persons of the Godhead, and since indeed not the entire Trinity became incarnate, nor did the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, but only the Son assume a human nature into the unity of His person,—therefore not the divine nature itself of the Logos, but only the person of the Son was united with the human nature. And the reader who is not forewarned might indeed be disturbed by this argument. But let the pious mind consider what Satan is seeking after by disputations of this kind, viz., that he may, so far as we are concerned, craftily snatch away from the hypostatic union of Christ our Savior the divine nature of the Logos, which having lost He could not be our Savior: because it is our greatest and sweetest consolation—since our poor human nature has through sin been separated and alienated from God, who is life itself, Isaiah 49 and Eph. 4—that a mass of it, consubstantial with ourselves, has again been most intimately joined and united, by the hypostatic union, with the divine nature in the person of the Son of God, in order that thus the restitution and reparation of it might be the more certain and sure and that for this reason we might in turn be made partakers of the divine nature in Christ, 2 Pet. 1, and obtain communion with the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. 1 John 1.

Of this most sweet consolation those wranglers who deny that the divine nature in the person of the Son of God has been united with the assumed human nature, are trying to deprive us. This opinion fights as with a bold front against the plainest testimony of Paul, Col. 2, where he lays

the foundation of our entire consolation in the fact that all the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily. But the fulness of the Godhead is whatever the Godhead is and has in itself. And that fulness of the Godhead of the Son of God, Paul affirms, dwells, not in part but as a whole, *σωματικῶς*, that is, personally or bodily, in the assumed body, as in its own temple, as the ancients say, who from this passage of Paul call the incarnation *ἐνσωμάτησις*, so that the sense of Paul beyond all controversy is this: That the entire fulness of the Godhead of the Son of God *σωματῆναι*, was embodied, as Tertullian says, or was made flesh. Whatever, therefore, the Godhead of the Logos is and has, all this is personally united with the assumed human nature. And so the Church has always said that the divine nature of the Logos was made incarnate, as we showed a little before from the statements of Dionysius, Athanasius, Cyril and John of Damascus. We refer also to Longobardus, book 3, chapter 5, where he shows from the teaching of the ancient Church that it is correct to say both that the person of the Son of God assumed the human nature and that the divine nature in the person of the Son is personally united with the assumed human nature. He cites this sentence from Augustine: That nature which was begotten of the Father assumed our nature without sin, and the form of God took the form of a servant. Again, The most high Godhead bears about with it the humanity united with itself. For he quotes from Jerome: The divine substance assumed the human substance. Thus also Hilary says, *De Trin.*, book 9: Our nature was united into the communion of the substance of immortality. Epiphanius also says, book 1, volume 3: The humanity is united with the Godhead. But what need is there to adduce many testimonies of the fathers, since the whole ancient Church affirms with one voice that in the incarnate Christ there are two natures, the divine and the human, and likewise that the person of the incarnate Christ consists of two natures united, the divine and the human?

Against this universal consent these wranglers claim that not the divine nature of the Son of God, but merely His hypostasis is united with the human nature. viz., as if

the hypostasis were apart from the Godhead or subsisted, as it were, outside and beyond the divinity. For the divine nature, as the Scholastics correctly say, is in the person and is predicated of the person, and the person subsists in the divine nature.

But the explanation of the argument which they use, namely, that the divine essence is common to the entire Trinity, usefully illustrates this doctrine and points out many things. In the preceding chapter, therefore, the terms essence, person and attributes were explained. and it was said that the essential attributes of the Godhead in no way differ from the essence of the Godhead, but are convertible with the essence itself, since they are one and the same thing; that is, they are simply the absolute essence of God itself; viz., eternity, immensity, majesty, omnipotence, all-sufficiency, wisdom, goodness, justice, immutability, immortality, invisibility, impassibility, etc., are the very essence of God itself, omnipotent, wise, etc.; and the essence of God is itself omnipotence, wisdom, etc. It is known, furthermore, that Luther in the disputations of the years 44 and 45, and together with him Philip Melanchthon also, taught against certain Scholastic wranglers: That among divines hypostasis or person is not something existing outside and beyond the divine essence, to which that essence is afterwards communicated with its essential properties; nor does the divine essence exist outside and apart from the persons of the Godhead. Nor do hypostasis and essence really differ in the same person, although they differ in the way they are considered. For else there would be added to the Trinity a Quaternity, namely, besides the three persons, the *essence* subsisting separately for itself.

But this most simple and altogether unique divine essence itself, together with its essential properties, is considered in a twofold way, as the Scholastics say: either absolutely as it is in itself and communicable to many, or as it is determinately in some one person of the Trinity; or as others say, the persons subsisting in this one most simple divine essence may be considered in a twofold way: either so far as they are considered absolutely and essentially, as they are common to the whole Trinity and to all three persons and being entire in each. Thus of the three persons

there is one and the same undivided divinity, essence, omnipotence, wisdom, etc., and of the Son of God or Logos there is one essence with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and He has the common essential attributes with them, even as He says, All things that the Father hath are Mine, and I and the Father are one. Or they are considered relatively, so far, namely, as in one and the same essence the persons are distinguished and incommunicable and differ among themselves, not indeed essentially but personally, by means of their hypostatic properties, relations and attributes, inasmuch as the Father is God the begetter, the Son is God the begotten, the Holy Spirit is God proceeding. And because these relations, in divine things, are not distinctions of reason only nor nude or inane compliments, as Sabellius taught, but they are true and real relations. Therefore the persons of the Trinity, although they are essentially one, still personally differ in reality through their relations, inasmuch as the Father is of no one and unbegotten, who from eternity begot of His own essence, His co-eternal and homoousian Son. The Son was begotten of the Father and He has received and has the divine essence by being begotten after the manner of generation from eternity. The Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son has received and has the divine essence from eternity by His proceeding or after the manner of an ineffable procession. These are the *τρόποι ὑπαρξεως* and the characteristic attributes, as John of Damascus says, by which the persons of the Trinity, subsisting in the one most simple divine essence, personally and really differ from one another, so that they each subsist per se and are incommunicable, as in Athanasius' and Cyril's compendious explanation of the faith the term hypostasis is defined to be a substance differing numerically, by certain properties of its own, from others which are of the same species.

But by means of these characteristic properties or personal differences the essential attributes of the Godhead are also, according to the manner of their existence, accommodated and applied to the individual persons, as the Scholastics say, or as Longobardus of the ancients says, they are limited and determined. Thus the one and the same most simple divine power, wisdom, goodness, etc., limited and determined

by the personal properties and hypostatic difference and as considered in the person of the Father are unbegotten, in the Son they are begotten and in the Holy Spirit they proceed; as Augustine in his work on the Trinity shows at length. He does not hesitate to affirm the same thing even of the essence itself, although the Scholastics afterwards called this matter in question, namely, as to whether it is correct to say that the essence is begotten or that it proceeds. These things the Greeks in their felicitous language express thus, according to Epiphanius: That the persons of the Trinity are not *συνούσιοι* (co-existent) nor *ταυταόσιοι* (absolutely identical), but *ὁμοούσιοι* (of the same essence). Thus, therefore, God is incarnate, not so far as He is simply God by reason of the absolute and common essence, but so far as He is God begotten and differs from God the begetter and from God proceeding, not indeed essentially, but personally and really. And the divine essence or nature is not incarnate so far as it is considered simply and absolutely, as common to all the persons of the Trinity, but so far as it is considered as limited and determined by its personal properties or mode of subsisting in the person of the Son as begotten of the Father; that is, the divine nature of the Logos, not in the three persons in common, but in the person of the Son alone assumed the flesh. And all the fulness of the Godhead, determined by the personal properties in the person of the Son, dwells bodily in Christ. Thus, therefore, the divine nature, although it is essentially common to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, is nevertheless in the person of the Son alone united with the human nature, without any incarnation of the Father and the Holy Spirit. And although the persons of the Trinity are mutually immanent, even as the Son says: I am not alone, but I am in the Father and the Father is in Me, nevertheless because this takes place without destroying the distinct subsistence of the persons and without concretion and commingling, and although the Son is not alone, but the Father and the Holy Spirit are at the same time in Him—still the Son alone and not the Father or the Holy Spirit assumed flesh and became man. It is this that the Toledo Canon says: The Son alone took the humanity into the unity of His person in accordance with that which is

peculiar to the Son, not that which is common to the Trinity. This the Scholastics express thus: The hypostatic union terminates, not in the unity of the essence so far as it is common, but in the unity of the person of the Son. It is, therefore, the true, certain and immovable teaching of the Scriptures that in the person of Christ incarnate there is not one nature only, namely, the human, but also the true, unique and most simple essence of the Godhead itself, which—not in all the persons of the Trinity in common, but in the person of the Son alone—is singularly united with the human nature, and by reason of this personally united divine nature or essence man is God, or the person of Christ the Mediator is God and has the divine attributes.

There must, however, be no mere idle disputing about the divine nature in Christ, but we must also meditate on the use of this doctrine. Of the causes indeed as to why it behoved our Mediator and Liberator, the God-man, to have not only the human but also the divine nature personally united in Him, we shall hereafter speak in the chapter concerning the personal union. But in this place we shall state certain things concerning the reasons why the second person of the Trinity, namely, the Son of God, was made man. We shall not, however, explore *a priori*, as it is said, the secret counsel of the Trinity, but because the Trinity wished none but the Son of God to be made man for us, we shall consider *a posteriori* what sweet consolations our faith conceives and draws from the fact that the middle person of the Trinity, namely, the Word, was made flesh. We shall follow in the footsteps of Athanasius in his book on the humanity of the Word.

John, then, says, chapter 1: The Word, through whom all things were made, was made flesh. Paul says, Col. 1: In Him all things consist, and He is the head of the body, of the Church. Hebrews 2: It became Him for whom are all things to be made the Captain of our salvation. Thus, then, that person of the Trinity through whom human nature had been created at the beginning and through whom it was itself sustained, so that it might not be annihilated, was sent by the Father unto its reparation and redemption, that *His* might be the regeneration (*ἀναπλασις*) whose had been the generation (*πλάσις*) as Justin says; and that

His might be the ἀνατίσσειν (re-creation) whose had been the κτίζειν (creation), as Athanasius says to Epictetus; that is, as the Latin writers say, that the same One might remake human nature who had made it in the beginning, as Augustine says. For it was not a matter of less wisdom and virtue or power to re-create (for so St. Bernard speaks) than to create man. Yea, this was accomplished by the Word alone. Concerning Him the Scriptures say indeed, Isaiah 53, 11: He shall see of the travail of His soul; and Isaiah 43, 24: Thou hast made Me to serve with thy sins. He therefore through whom the human race was made, "knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust." Ps. 103. Lest, therefore, He should lose those whom He created, He put on the body of a servant that He might free the flesh with the flesh. And this is a most certain proof of His will to redeem us. Nor can there be any doubt about His power; for He who was able to create man out of nothing was able also to restore him when fallen. To this the Scriptures refer when they call our restoration a creation, Eph. 2: Created in Christ Jesus.

1. This consideration, therefore, most beautifully shows both the will and the power to save in Christ our Liberator, and points out under how many obligations we are to our Lord and Redeemer, who when as yet we were not created us and when we had been lost restored us, as the ancients say.

2. John also adds this thought: In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. Therefore that person of the Godhead in whom had been the life and light of man even before the fall, was sent unto the work of redemption. For since through the fall we had been alienated from the life of God, Eph. 4, and since death through sin had passed upon all men, Rom. 5, we were not able to be snatched from death and to be restored to life, except through Him in whom the life was; yea, who was the Word of life and life itself. 1 John 1. And this renders our faith certain, that we are truly and potently freed from death through Christ and are brought to life eternal, because in Him was life; yea, He is life itself. Therefore he that believeth in Him, though he were dead, yet shall he live. John 11. He that hath the Son hath life, and this life is in His Son. 1 John 5.

How full of consolation these things are when devoutly considered.

3. In his work, *De Eccl. Dogmatibus*, chapter 2, Augustine says: He who by the divinity of His Father was the Son of God was made by the humanity of His mother the Son of man, lest we should believe there are two sons. But far sweeter is the reason which Irenæus gives, book 3, chapter 20: That we, namely, who were the children of wrath might receive the adoption of sons of God. To this no creature, but only He who by nature is the true and only begotten Son of God could bring us. Upon so firm a foundation, then, the gift of our adoption rests; for He who is the Son of God was made the Son of man, that He might give unto us the power to become the sons of God, John 1; even as He says in words most sweet, John 20: I ascend unto My Father and your Father. But if we are sons of God, then we are brothers and joint-heirs with Christ. Rom. 8. And, therefore, in the sweetest words as for His beloved brothers the incarnate Christ prays to His Father, John 17: Thou hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me. Again: That the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them. Eph. 1: He hath made us accepted in the Beloved, concerning whom, namely, He exclaimed: This is My beloved Son. I briefly mention those things only which might be profitably illustrated at greater length; for it is best that this mystery be treated in such a way that the doctrine may be applied to a devout purpose in the serious exercising of faith.

4. The Son of God is the image of the invisible God. Col. 1. Man was indeed in the beginning created in the image of God, Gen. 1, but this we lost in Adam, says Irenæus, book 3, chapter 20. When, therefore, God had determined to restore man and to renew His image He wished that person to become incarnate who is the brightness of His glory and the express image of the substance of God. Heb. 1.

5. The object of the redemption is that, being reconciled to God, we may be brought into favor with Him and be loved by Him. But now the Son of God, who is full of grace, John 1, and of the love of the Father, John 17. and in whom the soul of the Father delighteth, Isaiah 42 and

Matt. 3, by assuming our flesh has become our reconciliator, that of His fulness we might receive grace for grace. John 1. We are made beloved and accepted unto God in the Beloved. Eph. 1. On so firm a rock is the grace founded by which we are justified and saved, namely, on Christ our Redeemer.

6. The Scholastics add this argument: Because the Son of God is the middle person in the Trinity, therefore it was proper that that person should become the Mediator between God and men.

7. Athanasius adds this argument also: The Son of God is the Logos of the Father. He therefore came into the flesh that He might show us the Father and make the knowledge of Him known unto us.

These considerations show how profitable and pleasant is the use of the doctrine of the divine nature which is united with the human in the person of Christ.

WHOSE VICAR?

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PRETENSIONS OF THE BISHOP OF ROME.

LECTURE DELIVERED AT CAPITAL UNIVERSITY BY REV. L. H.
BURRY, MASSILLON, OHIO.

"Some years ago," so the story was related to me, "an Irishman was passing by a German Lutheran Church in the city of Milwaukee, when the congregation was singing, as only our German congregations can sing, Luther's battle hymn, 'Ein feste Burg.' It was not on a Sunday, nor was it, as far as he knew, a Roman holiday; in fact it was on the 31st of October, the day before *All Saints Day*, or as the Lutherans would say, it was *Reformation Day*; and Pat could not understand what it meant. By and by he met his spiritual father, who was, of course, also an Irishman. 'Your Reverence,' said he, 'and what holiday is it that the Dutch up there are celebrating?' 'Ah Pat, said he with a wave of the hand, as though he would indicate that it was

a matter not worth inquiring into, 'it is the Lutheran 4th of July.'"

In a recent Reformation day sermon, I recalled this story, and told how it was indeed a "4th of July," not only for Lutherans, but for a whole emancipated world—a 4th of July without which, as an eminent statesman said at the opening of our World's Fair, this American Republic would have no existence and would be an impossibility; for it was on this day, October 31, 1517, that Martin Luther nailed his 95 theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg and gave the Pharaoh of Rome, who had held the church in bondage, lo, for many years, notice that the God of Israel had intended to lead His people forth from the bondage of Rome to the freedom of the children of God.

These remarks were published to the world, and Rome, who has censors over the Associated Press, so that nothing may be published that may reflect on her proud claims, of course, would not allow such a statement to go by unchallenged; and so I was taken to task by an erring brother, who still sits in the lap of Rome; not indeed in the manner in which John Huss was answered, nor yet was I cursed on the style of the Council of Trent, but I was met in so gentle and polite a way, as to almost make one feel like apologizing for giving utterance to the truth.

The statement that the Church, prior to the Reformation, was in captivity to Rome, and that the Roman bishop, who poses as the pope or vicar of Jesus Christ, is an usurper, was met by the defender of Rome with denial, of course, and the counter claim, that Christ Himself had appointed Peter as His vicar, and that Peter, as the first bishop of Rome, handed down this dignity to his successors, and that the Church of Rome has successfully maintained this position for lo, these many years; and entrenched in this claim, and resting on the theory that "possession is nine-tenths of the law," and with a what-are-you-going-to-do-about-it air, my friend thinks that he has settled the whole matter.

There have been pretenders for the throne of England whose claims were so ingeniously spun and woven, that it required all the acumen of the best statesmen to find the flaws; and indeed after they were found, there were those who still believed these claims just, and upheld them. But

if ever there was a claim in the weaving of which the brightest minds were employed, some of them honestly too, if ever men exercised their wits to uphold and fortify what had been so ingeniously woven, it was when the papacy was set up.

But while it may be a difficult task to unmask this great wrong, which is backed by so great a power, we have the promise of Jesus Christ, that against His Church which He has founded, the gates of hell shall not prevail, and in the Providence of God the history of His Church and the footprints of the pretender, who oppressed her have been preserved, so that the great wrong may be traced to its beginnings, and through its successive usurpations.

But notwithstanding the assurances we have, of men who were better qualified than we, who have weighed the evidence and left us their verdict, it is in an honest endeavor to examine and weigh the claims and evidence myself, that I have set myself the task, and invite you to consider with me the claims of the bishop of Rome, while we ask ourselves the question:

WHOSE VICAR?

But lest I appear to be setting up and fighting a man of straw, let me first state the claims of the bishop of Rome, not as defined by any individual priest or theologian, but as expressed by the great Roman Catholic Council of Trent. This council, whose decrees were endorsed by 255 members, two-thirds of them Italians, and countersigned by Pope Pius IV, was convened, with some interruptions, at Trent from A. D. 1545-1563. It was called ostensibly to satisfy the clamor of the people for a reformation of the Roman clergy and church, but especially to take measures against the real Reformation. In Art. 10, in the so-called Tridentine creed, or creed of Pius IV—a creed which every Roman Catholic layman even, must subscribe,—it is said: "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church, for the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ."—Do you know that word "mistress," tempts me to stop and make a comparison of the Church of Rome—the mistress—

with the scarlet woman of the Babylon, that sits on the seven hills, spoken of in the Revelation of St. John? But like the lawyer, I must not let anything take my attention from, but must keep my eye on the subject, the Roman bishop. That Council of Trent was a body fearfully given to cursing, and not alone did they, at the end of every statement curse everybody black and blue, who differed with them, but when they wound up their deliberations, after eighteen years, they did it with the curse: "Anathema to all heretics! Anathema! Anathema!" But really we need have no fear, to examine these truths ourselves, for the members of that council are all dead, and for aught I know, may have a taste of their own medicine; and the present bishop of Rome will have to pardon us, if we exercise the same God-given privilege claimed by him, of proving all things and holding fast that which is good. I mean to ask some questions, and appeal to God's Word, to history and any legitimate source of information, the decrees of the Council of Trent, to the contrary notwithstanding:

I. Did Jesus Christ institute the office of Pope or Vicar and confer it on St. Peter?

It does appear that when Jesus walked among men the idea of a pope or something akin to a pope, was trying to lift up its head, but it did not come from Jesus Christ. There were struggles among the apostles at times for supremacy. Look at the questions they put to Jesus—even to the end—in regard to the kingdom He should establish, and who should be greatest among them. As they go down to Jerusalem for the last time, even the mother of two of the disciples intercedes for her sons (Matt. 21, 20), that they may sit in chief places in Christ's kingdom. But Jesus' answer was, that he who would be chiefest among them should be the servant of all (Mark 10, 44). Calling attention to the scribes and Pharisees, who loved to be called Rabbi, Jesus said: "Be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master even Christ; and all ye are brethren, and call no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ." (Matt. 23, 8-10.) "But whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be

exalted." Matt. 23, 12.) This spirit of pride and ambition showing itself even to the end, Christ gave them all a lasting example, by Himself washing the disciples' feet.

In the face of these plain declarations, the bishops of Rome, however, ask you to turn to the account of an affair given in Matthew, *previous* to the explanation which we have just quoted (Matt. 16, 18, 19), where Jesus said to Peter: "Blessed art thou Bar-Jona. . . . I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," etc.

"There," they say, "does that not prove that Peter was appointed Christ's vicar, and therefore the chief of the apostles; and was not the Church built upon him? And was not Peter the first bishop of Rome, and did he not entail this power to his successors?"

Oh no; let us look at that account again. Going back a little, in Matt. 16, we find that Christ had asked, "Who do men say that I am?" And *Peter* answered,—he was impetuous and usually first to speak,—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Upon this *confession*, which embraced Jesus Christ, Jesus said, "Thou art Peter (*πέτρος* a rock, masculine form), and upon this rock (*πέτρα* a rock, feminine form) I will build my Church." Which rock—*Peter*, or the *confession that embraced Christ*,—was the one on which the Church was built? If Peter for a moment entertained the idea that he was the vicar of Christ and the Rock upon which the Church was built, the conceit would have been taken out of him, when a few moments after, perhaps, Peter began to rebuke Christ, when He foretold His sufferings, and Christ rebuked him with the words: "Get thee behind me Satan; thou art an offense unto me, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." (Matt. 16, 23.) If the Church had really been built on *Peter*, then, notwithstanding the promise of Christ, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, the Church would have fallen with her foundation; for when Peter denied his Savior and before his repentance, he fell, and was in a fallen condition. But even Peter did

not think that; for later on, in his first epistle (1 Pet. 2, 4, 6), written in A. D. 60, before Matthew's account was sent forth, Peter himself speaks of Jesus Christ as the elect, precious corner-stone, upon which Zion is builded. Nay, far was it from Peter to think this, for but a month or two after this discourse with Jesus, in a sermon at Jerusalem (Acts 4, 11), he again alludes to Christ Himself as the stone upon which salvation alone is builded, and that there is "no other name under heaven whereby men can be saved." Paul's testimony as regards the rock is interesting, for he also says that the rock of our salvation is Christ (1 Cor. 10, 4) and that "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid which is Christ Jesus." (1 Cor. 3, 11.) And while we are at it, it would be wrong to suppose that even the early church fathers had any such idea of that passage, for Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, St. Augustine, and Innocent I (the latter counted as among the popes)—church fathers of the third, fourth and fifth centuries, interpreted the *πέτρα*—the rock on which the Church was built, partly of Christ and partly of the confession of Peter; and not until A. D. 431, at the Council of Ephesus, was the attempt made to refer it to Peter.* Even the attempt to make it appear that Christ had given the office of the keys to Peter alone (Matt. 16, 19), and not to all the apostles, in whose name Peter spoke, is in conflict with the words of Jesus after His resurrection, when He breathed on all His disciples and said unto them: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit," etc. (John 20, 22).

When Jesus Christ was about to leave the disciples, or withdraw His visible form, and they seemed downcast, He never in the least hinted at this vicarship; this idea of a double head to the Church, one in heaven and one on earth; but He said, "Lo I am with you alway"; "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them." And I am glad that He never did, for when there were three or four popes at one time, hissing at and anathematizing each other, what a monster the Church would have been with all these heads! And again, when there was no pope, and the Church had lost her head and founda-

* Kurtz Ch. Hist. Vol. I, p. 269; Inst. Cat. Diet. St. Louis, 1876, p. 291.

tion; or when the pope was asleep or drunk, or—, in what a pitiable plight were she placed!

So far, then, I have not been able to find any trace of a "Prince among the apostles and a vicar of Jesus Christ." Even if we did, we would still have a long way to go to find the connection with Rome. But we have promised to follow the history of the Church and look for the footsteps of the pretender, and so I ask again, as though the question were as yet not settled:

II. *Did St. Peter exercise the office of Pope or Vicar of Christ among the disciples, after Christ's ascension?*

If Peter was the primate or "prince of the apostles," they ought to know it, and give evidence somewhere; for they have mentioned the election of a successor to Judas, and the election of deacons, and many other minor matters. Let him have the benefit of anything that may have been accorded him by the apostles. It is true that Peter was active and prominent among the apostles. He that so shamefully denied Christ, tried if possible, to make amends by his subsequent activity and zeal in spreading the kingdom of Christ. It is said that he never heard the cock crow but what he thought of his sin and wept; but, however active, zealous and honored he was, as far as the testimony of the apostles goes, Peter never thought of being pope, never acted as if he were pope, and the apostles never recognized in him the "Vicar of Jesus Christ" or an infallible head of the Church, but looked upon him as only one of their number, an equal, a brother.

All their teaching is to that effect. Jesus Christ had not been silent on the subject, as to who should be an authority here on earth, in such things as were not decided by the Word of God, which was to be the norm and rule by which all things were to be regulated, and not as they teach in the Roman Church, where even the Word of God is subject to the interpretation and construction of the pope; and the apostles all knew that Jesus had given the office of the keys to the whole Church, for He had said: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained" (Jno. 20, 22, 23); they knew that whatever authority and promise He had given

them, was given them collectively as a Church, inasmuch as He said: "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them" (Matt 18, 20); "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask it shall be done of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 18, 19); "If thy brother trespass . . . tell it to the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church let him be unto thee as a heathen man and as a publican." (Matt. 18, 15-18).

And they all recognized and reiterated this in their teachings, Peter not excepted. The very word the apostles chose to designate the Church, *ἐκκλησία*, meant the assembly. Nor did they mean by *ἐκκλησία* what is meant in the Roman Church, where the *ἐκκλησία* means the assembly of pope, bishops, priests, monks, nuns, who are represented in an early engraving as sitting in a boat called church, while they throw out a rope to the laity, who are swimming in the water; but the whole *ἐκκλησία* or assembly of saints is meant.

In writing to this Church in general, Peter himself says: "Ye also, as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. . . . Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who has called you from darkness to His marvelous light" (1 Pet. 2, 5, 9). And speaking to the elders—the presbyters—in the Church, he calls himself only a fellow elder, and no more, and warns them against lording it over God's heritage, while he speaks of Jesus Christ Himself, as the Chief Shepherd, who will reward all faithfulness; and there is not one iota that can be construed to mean that Peter thought himself a pope. I will not cite you any expressions in which the other apostles take the same ground as I might, e. g. 1 Tim. 3, 15.

And what is plainly taught in words, that the Church is the highest authority in things not decided by the Word, and that even among the apostles there was an equality and not a pope, that is more plainly taught by the acts and deeds of the apostles.

It was not by appointment of St. Peter, but by the lot or votes of all the 120 disciples assembled, that a successor to Judas was chosen in the person of Matthias (Acts 1). The Holy Ghost, on Pentecost day, fell upon all the apostles alike (Acts 2). When deacons were chosen in the early Christian Church, the twelve called together the disciples, and the multitude chose the deacons, and *all* the apostles laid hands upon them. (Acts 6.) Instead of Peter appointing and sending men out to do missionary work, or carry out a commission, as one might expect a pope to do, the apostles sent Peter and John to Samaria to assist Philip in his work there. (Acts 8, 14.) When a question arose in regard to circumcision that could not be decided by certain of the disciples themselves, instead of referring it to Peter, as one would be expected to do to a pope, a council or synod was called at Jerusalem, when the apostles and elders came together; and at that council not only Peter gave his judgment, but James, and Paul, and Barnabas spoke, James being the last speaker; whereupon the apostles and elders, and the whole Church, sent chosen men and letters to the Church at Antioch, giving their decision in the matter. (Acts 15.) And not only was Peter pleased to act with the other apostles as his equals, but when it became necessary, as at times it did, to reprove Peter, or contend with him, he meekly bowed under the charges, as for example Paul tells us (Gal. 2, 11), "When Peter was come to Antioch I withstood him face to face, because he was to be blamed."

So we may look where we will among the apostles, Peter was simply one of them, a prominent man among equals; nothing more. If the Church of Christ had been built on him, if he is the "Vicar of Christ," through whom we must deal with Christ, if the salvation of millions of souls is dependent on recognizing Peter and the so-called successors, it is strange that there should be such a silence in the teachings of Christ and His apostles, and that all history of their acts should teach us the contrary.

But let us go on, and see if we can, where these claims begin to manifest themselves.

III. *Did the early Christian Church, when the disciples of the apostles, and their disciples again, still lived,—the Church, say of the first four centuries,—recognize Peter as*

the head of the Church and the "Vicar of Christ," with the entailment of this office on the bishops of Rome, his successors?

The early history of the Church or congregation at Rome during the first centuries, is almost wholly enveloped in a cloud of mystery, which is only now and then broken by a gleam of historic light. Only after the Christian Church became an influence in the State, and finally the State Church, in the fourth century, does it enter the field of history.*

It is a question that can never be fully settled, whether Peter ever was at Rome. Paul founded and Paul wrote epistles to the congregation at Rome; but as far as Peter is concerned, the only accounts we have bearing on this subject besides tradition, is an expression or date in one of St. Peter's letters, in which he speaks of being in "Babylon," which by way of interpretation may mean Rome. If Peter ever was at Rome, it must have been late in life, and if he was bishop or elder there, the question is still, Did the Church in general recognize him as the pope? And if it did, the question is still, Did Peter entail this office on his successors at Rome?—a long list of questions and a long string of "ifs", a rope of sand on which all this glory of Rome depends!

Even before I launch out in an attempt to explain how this thing—this vapory atom, around which, as a nucleus, other atoms were gathered, which by a series of evolutions finally resulted in a pope,—the whole thing looks preposterous. You have all heard of John, the disciple Jesus loved, him who was one of the favored three who with Jesus in the mount of transfiguration, in Gethsemane and at the house of Jairus, him who in his Gospel, like an eagle ascended at one flight to highest point in the doctrine of Christ, and in a few words said: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"—him to whom God revealed unspeakable things, as seen in the Book of Revelation,—the peer of Peter in every respect: he is the only one of the apostles that died a natural

* Kurtz Ch. Hist. Vol. III, p. 264.

Vol. XVIII—7.

death. He is said to have attained a great age, even 100 years or more; and while it is only a matter of conjecture, he is said to have lived as late as A. D. 89 or even 120. According to early writers, Peter, however, is said to have suffered death in A. D. 67 or 68. Allowing John to have lived twenty years longer than Peter, according to Rome's pretensions, we are then to suppose that the *successor* of Peter at Rome, if Peter ever was at Rome, was a prince over John and the "Vicar of Christ," over him who had been Christ's special friend! But let that pass, and let us see what we may see in the early ages in regard to our subject. After the death of the apostles, who were doubtless the leaders of the Church as long as they lived, the Church was at a loss for a while. The books of the Bible had not been gathered as yet, and congregations were even more dependent on each other, and on synods and on conferences, than in our day, when we have the whole Bible in every home, and our catechisms, and creeds, and books of devotion, and church papers, to guide us. New ideas, new errors, were constantly arising; and what is more natural than that men should look to those pastors who were more experienced, or who had been disciples of the disciples, or had congregations that were once served by the apostles themselves, for advice? And what is more natural, than that the men to whom recognition was *accorded as an honor*, should by and by *expect* and *claim* such honors; and what is more natural than that such cities, as had been "*sedes apostolicæ*," such as Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Rome, should feel a little above other cities, on account of the apostles having been there, though at first they were a mutual admiration society, living together as equals,—"*sedes apostolicæ*" all.*

But as time rolled on there were jealousies and strife, and in time some of the cities that had been "*sedes apostolicæ*", dropped out of the race, as they lost their importance, or as the congregations there ceased to exist, and the ambition of others grew, as their cities grew in importance and their rivals grew weaker. In the course of a century or two, the claims narrowed down to two places: old Rome,

* Kurtz Ch. Hist. Vol. III, p. 185.

the metropolis of the world, and the new Rome, or Constantinople, the new seat of the Roman emperors.*

Prior to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, the bishop of Rome never claimed the dignity of a pope. The claim that legates of Sylvester presided at that council, is a pure fabrication. In the Arian controversy, the bishop of Rome did not claim to be an authority on either side.

Not until A. D. 344, did the bishop of Rome claim authority over the Eastern Church, in giving validity to any matter. In this year, after the most of the Eastern bishops had withdrawn from the Council of Sardica, circumstances obliged the council to agree to hand over to Julius I, bishop of Rome,—a steadfast, consistent, orthodox man, in this age of error—the right to receive appeals from neighboring bishops; but this affected only the one man Julius, and was soon forgotten—only Rome did not forget.*

Not until A. D. 431, in the time of Cœlestine, at the Council of Ephesus, was any attempt made to refer the $\pi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha$, upon which the Church was built, to Peter, and to claim the primacy for the bishop of Rome as of divine authority. Leo, the Great, who after a short incumbency of Sixtus III, followed Cœlestine, pushed this claim, A. D. 440, with his whole heart, notwithstanding the protests of the churches; and he may be said to have established the papacy, though later popes gave the thing a more papal term.†

As I have said, there always were protests, and there never was a time in history when the whole Christian Church acknowledged the pretensions of the Roman bishops. The Church of Abyssinia—the Ethiopian Church, e. g., founded by missionaries from Alexandria about A. D. 350, and in some way isolated from the rest of the Christian Church, and therefore not affected by the changes that affected the rest of the Church, never heard of the Roman claim of primacy, and that there was a “Vicar of Christ” on earth, until the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; and when Rome attempted to put the yoke of bondage upon them, they defended their freedom and signed their “Declaration of Independence,” as it were, in blood; and to this day they are

* Kurtz Ch. Hist. Vol. III, p. 265.

† Kurtz Ch. Hist. Vol. III, p. 269.

free. It may be of interest, while we speak of these people, to say, that cut off from the rest of the world, since A. D. 350, they never heard of Purgatory, Extreme Unction and other practices that undoubtedly had their origin, not in the early Church, or in the Word of God, but in Rome.

In A. D. 431 the Cœlestine above mentioned tried to act the pope, and interfered with a case of discipline in Africa, citing as his authority to do so, a Nicene Canon; but the African Synod held at Carthage answered him, that after searching the churches in Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria they had failed to find any such canon.

When the bishop of Rome began to push his claim of primacy, the bishop of Constantinople, the "New Rome" conceived himself not only to be the equal of "Old Rome" then in decrepitude, but his superior, and styled himself the "Œcumenical Bishop." But Gregory the Great, who is generally looked upon as the founder of the temporal power of the pope in Italy, thereupon styles the bishop of Constantinople "Lucifer", and as for himself he took the title "Servus Servorum Dei,"—a title borne in proud humility, even by the pope of to-day, who lives in a style of luxury hardly ever attempted by any king or emperor. And this Gregory, in a letter to the patriarch of Alexandria, who had addressed him as "Universalis Papa", distinctly refuses the title, concedes to Alexandria and Antioch equal honors with himself and denounces any bishop who assumes such title and sets himself up above his fellow bishops, as the "fore-runner of the Antichrist." All this as late as A. D. 590-625.

No, we cannot follow these claims and contradictions down in detail through the centuries; but to explain matters in a few words, would say, that every circumstance seemed to favor Rome. The patriarchal arrangement, which robbed the congregation of its rights and gave these rights into the hands of an episcopacy, was a good starting point for Rome; then the idea that the Church needed a visible head, lent the papal idea aid; then the ignorance and superstition of the middle ages was a fruitful field to cultivate the idea—just as Rome always thrives best where ignorance and superstition prevails and vice versa. Then the tottering empires and monarchs of the East and West, each trying to gain the favor of the Church, as the politician works the Roman

Church to-day, and the Roman Church works the politician—favored the growth of papacy; and then when we remember that Rome was the only “*sedes apostolicæ*” in the West, and then our German forefathers, who had been taught papal ideas by the missionaries of Rome, were building up empires upon the ruins of effete Roman kingdoms, and that the pope always managed to stand up with the growing prevailing kingdoms, against the waning, we will understand to some extent “on what meat this our Cæsar feeds that he is becoming so great”—and how Rome reached that stage in temporal power, where she could make or unmake kings.

I have said or shown then, that in the early Christian Church there was no evidence or authority upon which to base the claims of the pope at Rome; but such trifles as that are easily overcome there. Where there is no history to quote, she simply has it manufactured to order. There are, of course, some documents extant, that were written by earlier bishops of Rome, but not such as the bishop of Rome needed. How and what if some day, some one should arise, as there was one now and then, and would question his right to rule the Church as the “Vicar of Christ”?

Some good friend helped him in this dilemma, and forged some ninety-four epistles or decrees, which he ascribed to early bishops of Rome. Up to A. D. 863 these Decretals, as they were called, were unknown to the church-fathers or to any bishop of Rome, but they came in handy, and in A. D. 864 the pope began to make use of them, and was much obliged, for by them he could establish the missing links and furnish a chain of popes that went back even to St. Peter. But alas for the Decretals, though good papists in early days never thought to ask any questions, the Reformers of a later date did, and no rascality is so cunningly arranged that it will not leave its footprints.* Protestant scholars have always annoyed the pope, and he can't help but curse them now and then; and they ask such embarrassing questions. They call attention to the fact in these Decretals, that bishops who lived in the classic ages of Tacitus write barbarous Latin like the monks of the ninth century.

**Ante Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VIII, p. 601.

And that would be equivalent to Martin Luther writing a letter in Pennsylvania German. Then they notice that these early bishops quote from the Vulgate Bible hundreds of years before it was translated—that would be equivalent to Luther citing the Revised Version of our day or the Declaration of Independence. They call attention to a letter written by a bishop of Rome in A. D. 192 to a bishop who lived in Alexandria in A. D. 385,—that would be equivalent to Luther writing to Coxey or President McKinley. Then they found letters written by men, who had written them in the time of senators who died before the writers were born; and then they found letters too, written by men who lived long before the Franks existed as a nation, and yet were familiar with the customs of the Franks in the ninth century, and that would be equivalent to Luther being familiar with our elections and customs; all of which might be compared to a letter written by Martin Luther in the time of St. Augustine, in the Pennsylvania German dialect to Coxey, in which he asks him: "Vell, vie hot dich die election gepleased?" Some men would call such letters a forgery, but Pope Nicholas I, who is logically the first real Pope on the present order (A. D. 858-867) liked these Decretals, and just adopted them!

Well, we will not follow the growth further. There is many a hook and crook down to our day, but I have lived, I hope, to see the cup of iniquity full; for though I did not understand it at the time, I can remember when, on July 18th, 1870, the pope at Rome by a packed house—though not without great opposition was declared "Infallible", and if I remember aright, it was at that time as a sample of his "infallibility" he declared Napoleon III the "Invincible Ruler"!

Now I do not know whether I ought in conclusion ask the question,—but a few words will be in place—

IV. *How did the lives and the doctrines of the popes agree with the doctrine and life of St. Peter?* Would Peter have felt elated to have thought of them as his successors? I once had a colored acquaintance who gained some reputation as a jubilee singer; pointing him to a little black boy, I asked, "Mr. Turner, is that your boy?" "Now!" said he, "if I had a tar-bucket like that I would throw him into the

ribber." I wonder what Peter would have said, or will say, when such men claim to be his successors, as taught the doctrines of Purgatory, the sacrifice of the mass, transubstantiation, the immaculate conception, the assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven,—that forbid men to eat meat, and to marry, and other things, that Paul calls doctrines of devils? I wonder what he, who taught that there is salvation in no other, and that there is no other name given under heaven whereby we can be saved but in the name of Jesus,—I wonder what he would say of the decrees of the Council of Trent, which teach that the Virgin Mary ought to be invoked, and that we are not saved by the merits of Christ alone apprehended by faith, but by our own good works? And then—

I wonder what he would say when he reads the "infallible" decrees of one pope, which are condemned as heresy by another "infallible" pope or a council, as was the case in A. D. 384-398, when Siricius and Anastasius were at loggerheads;* or again when Honorius I (A. D. 625) uttered a heresy for which he was condemned by the œcumenical council of A. D. 681, and by Leo II, and every subsequent pope? Would he care to recognize them, especially when there were two, and three or four popes at the same time, all in his name hissing anathemas at each other?

And then, I wonder what he would say if he were to look through the history of some of these gentlemen, the "Vicars of Christ"—and "the successors of St. Peter?" This is not washday and we do not propose to bring out and expose all the soiled linens, but we cannot help but refer to the fact that there is a great deal that the "Vicar of Christ" don't care to have hung on the line, in the light of day. Of course there have been gentlemen among the popes, but there have been incarnate devils among them. Sylvester II (999-1003) studied magic and is reported to have been in league with the devil; Benedict IX (1033-1048), infamous for his vices, finally sold his office to Gratian, and then when several popes were trying to hold it at once and squabbling over it, he took it once again. Let us pass over the story of the female Pope Joan, who is said to have died from child-

* Kurtz Ch. Hist. Vol. III, p. 266.

bearing during a procession; for the story is disputed. But when we come to the name of John, by which some twenty popes called themselves, we must say, that we do not blame the popes of the past three centuries that none of them cares to be known by that name. John X, who was raised to the throne by his paramour, and afterwards strangled by her daughter's husband (914-929), John XI, son of Pope Sergius III, and the notorious Marozin, who was dragged from the orgies of the papal palace, together with his adulterous mother, and soon afterwards died; John XII, who was condemned by a council of perjury, adultery, and murder (in 936), and deposed, but having himself reinstated by another council, died of apoplexy in an adulterous bed,—and other Johns accused of various crimes, one even being a pirate, make up that list. And Alexander VI, the father of the infamous Borgias, the pope who gave Spain all America discovered beyond a certain limit,—the pope who lived when Luther was born, and who as the most profligate of of all the popes, probably filled the cup of iniquity and made ready for the Reformation,—the pope who died by a poison cup he had prepared for an opponent,—him yet we but mention, and then drop that subject, and ask again: What would Peter think of such men as the "Vicars of Jesus Christ," and "successors of St. Peter"?

Ah, it is a question: Whose Vicar? While there are those who look upon *Nero* as the anti-Christ, of whom the Word of God speaks at different places; our own church fathers regard papal Rome erected on the ruins of pagan Rome, as the Babylon of prophecy; and when they recall how the Church of Rome has stained her garments, and was drunken with the blood of martyrs, and when they think of a poor, sinful man sitting on a throne "in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2), and when they see that so many have been deceived by lying signs and wonders to believe a lie, they point to the throne erected at the vatican, and to him who is seated there, no matter whether he personally is an intentional deceiver or a deceived man, and say, Behold the anti-Christ!*

As though this conclusion had never been reached, and

* Smalcald Articles, Part I, Art. 4. Compare also the expression of Pope Gregory the Great, given above.

accepted, and in an attempt to reach our own independent conclusion, I point to the claims of the bishop of Rome, and then to the facts of history, and ask, Whose Vicar?

God knows, and will judge fully and righteously; but this I feel free to say, inasmuch as God tells me not to believe every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God, that were Christ to come into the world to judge as He some day shall come, He would say to this would-be "Vicar," this would-be "Peter," as He said to the real Peter, who substituted his own ideas for the intentions of his God: "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense to me; for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." ((Matt. 16. 23).

THE ONENESS OF THEME AND PLAN OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY REV. G. FINKE, LE MARS, IOWA.

The Pentateuch contains the record of the covenant which the Lord made with His chosen people at Sinai. *The establishment of Israel as the chosen people of the Lord*, is the theme which the writer of the Pentateuch adheres to throughout the whole work. Everything in it bears upon this theme. Ex. 19, 24, where the conclusion of the covenant is recorded, is the central point of the entire Pentateuch, which is divided by it into two main sections. All preceding chapters of Genesis and Exodus prepare for the establishment of the covenant, while all that follows is the development of the established covenant. Gen. 1—Ex. 19, contains the history which prepares for the covenant that the Lord made with His people, while Ex. 20—Deut. 31, 23, records the constitution, laws and institutions which the Lord grants unto His people. The more detailed our examination of the contents of the Pentateuch will be, the more it will become evident that everything in it is in some relation to the theme which we stated above. We will content ourselves here to show by a rapid survey of the contents

that the writer pursues from the first to the last chapter but *one* theme. In doing so we will get also a glimpse of the oneness of plan and structure of the Pentateuch.

A. THE HISTORY PREPARATORY TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COVENANT

(Gen. 1—Ex. 19) may be divided into three sections.

I. *The preliminary history of the chosen people* (Gen. 1-11). The writer tells here the history of the world from the creation to the flood (antediluvian period, ch. 1-9), and from that onward to Abraham (Noachic period, ch. 6-11) always in regard to the main design of his work. The contents of these eleven chapters show the necessity of the separation of Abraham, which is the first step towards the establishment of the theocracy in Israel. The original covenant between God and man was broken by the fall of man. The Lord gave the promise of redemption to the fallen race. But the wickedness of the latter grew more and more, until God destroyed the wicked world by the flood. The pious Noah and his family were spared. After the flood the Lord renewed His covenant with them. But the human race again became more and more corrupt (Babel!). To attain His ends the Lord calls Abraham as the father of a people which He will separate from other nations and make His own people.

That everything in this period tends to the separation of Abraham, the father of the chosen people, is also shown by the manner in which the genealogy and history of the different lines are given. The genealogy of the chosen race is the thread on which the history runs. The history and genealogy of the divergent lines is always taken up first and traced down so far as it is of interest in the light of the writer's design, not to be taken up again in the course of history. After that the history of the chosen race is taken up. Thus, for instance, the descendants of Noah's sons are given first (Gen. 10), to show in a brief survey their connection with the chosen race, and after that the chosen line of Shem is traced down to Terah, the father of Abraham. This narrowing process is pursued throughout the Genesis.

II. *The beginnings of the chosen people, or the history*

of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob or Israel (Gen. 12-50). The Lord singles Abraham out from the rest of mankind and makes a special covenant with him, in which He promises him numerous seed, the possession of Canaan for him and his seed, and that through him a blessing should come upon all people on earth. The same promise is repeatedly made to Isaac and Jacob. The narrowing process is pursued even among Abraham's own descendants. Ishmael and the sons of Keturah are sundered out from the chosen family; their descendants are traced and dismissed from further consideration in history, before the history of the main line through Isaac is taken up. In Isaac's family Esau is removed and his descendants are traced, not to be taken up again, after which the direct line of Jacob is taken up. Since his sons are the fathers of the twelve tribes of Israel, no further singling out is necessary. By God's providence Jacob is brought to Egypt. The book of Genesis concludes with a view on the future return to the promised land.

We admire the genial way in which the writer of the Genesis connects the history of the patriarchs and of the world with the establishment of the theocracy in Israel, as it is recorded in the last four books of the Pentateuch. The contents of the latter would be entirely without foundation without the history of the patriarchs. And the latter again rests on the history of mankind as told in Gen. 1-11. One cannot be without the other. What could we make out of the separation, the promise, the theocracy, etc., without knowing anything of the fall of mankind and its wickedness following the fall? Thus the Genesis is inseparably connected with the rest of the Pentateuch.

That the whole book of Genesis is worked up on *one* plan may also be shown by its formal division into ten sections, each of which is separated from the other by the same heading, Thloedoth of . . . (history of . . .). The antediluvian period is divided into five Thloedoth, correspondingly also the noachic period. The history of the creation 1, 1-2, 3) is the foundation. On this foundation are built the Thloedoth of 1) Heaven and Earth 2, 4-4,26), 2) Adam (5, 1-6, 8), 3) Noah (6, 9-9, 29), 4) the sons of Noah (10, 1-11, 9), 5) Shem (11, 10-26), 6) Terah (11, 27-25, 11), 7) Ishmael

(25, 12-18), 8) Isaac (25, 19-35, 29), 9) Esau (ch. 36), 10) Jacob (37-50).

III. *Preparation for the establishment of the covenant* (Ex. 1-19). This section contains the preparation for the exodus (1-13) and the exodus and march to Sinai (14-19).—The book is connected with the Genesis by enumerating in the opening the children of Jacob who came into Egypt. Then a brief statement is made of the growth of the chosen family to a numerous people and of their suppressions by the kings of Egypt, which make them sigh for deliverance (ch. 1). The Lord appoints Moses His instrument for the deliverance of His elected people (2-6), Moses' audiences with the Pharaoh are reported, the plagues effect at last the deliverance (7-13). Then follows the exodus, the crossing of the Red Sea and the march to Sinai under the Lord's guidance (14-19).

We notice that most of the time the children of Israel lived in Egypt, that is to say, from the death of Joseph, which is recorded in the last chapter of Genesis, to the birth of Moses, a period of 280 years, is disposed of by a few brief statements in Ex. 1, while the history of the patriarchs in Genesis and that of Moses in Exodus is given very minutely. The negative critics declare this to be a chasm or break in the history of the Pentateuch, which is said to be due to the fact that the writer found no documents which cover the period which he treated so briefly in his work. But this claim rests upon a total misunderstanding of purpose and plan of the writer of the Pentateuch. It is wrongly presupposed by those critics that the latter intended to narrate all events in the development of the elected people or to give a chronological history. But this is the intention neither of the author of the Pentateuch nor of any of the writers of the other historical books of the Old Testament. They always have a definite theme and plan which they pursue in their books. And it is in our place to try to conceive the leading idea and the plan of the books, and not to lay down rules how and what the holy writers should have written. The leading thought of the Pentateuch is easily to be conceived, it is the establishment of the theocracy in Israel. Everything in the history of Israel that does not relate to this theme is omitted. In fact it is enough to know

the situation of the people as it is described in Ex. 1, to know the whole history of the people in the last centuries, as far as it is of interest in the light of the theme. All events that are not recorded were not of sufficient importance for the theocracy which was to be established. The apparent break in the history is therefore not to be accounted for by the defect of documents or knowledge of the period, but by the vigorous adherence of the author to his theme and plan.

B. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COVENANT AND THE LEGISLATION OF THE PENTATEUCH

(Ex. 20—Deut. 31, 23) may be subdivided into four parts.

I. *The establishment of the covenant and the realization of it* by the setting up of the tabernacle and the Lord's taking up His abode in it (20-40). After the proclamation of the fundamental laws of the covenant the latter is ratified (20-24). After that detailed instructions are given for the construction of the tabernacle as the Lord's dwelling place (25-31). The construction itself is postponed on account of the breach of the covenant (golden calf! 32-34). After the setting up of the tabernacle the Lord takes His abode in it (35-40). Hereby the covenant is realized. For by it the theocracy which was established by the covenant, is typically represented. All further development of the legislation is meant to preserve and to strengthen the covenant.

II. *The laws and institutions respecting the spiritual life of the Lord's people* are contained in Leviticus. In ch. 1-16 such laws and institutions are given which open for the people the free access to the throne of its King and Lord. These are the laws concerning the sacrifices at the tabernacle (1-7), the consecration of the priests (8-10), and ordinances concerning cleanliness, uncleanness, and purification (11-15). All this culminates in the annual day of atonement (ch. 16). —Ch. 17-26 contains such ordinances which enable the people to enjoy undisturbedly the community with their Lord. These ordinances require in one word holiness of the people. Ch. 27 is an appendix respecting vows.

By the Lord's taking up His residence in the midst of His people the relation of the Lord towards Israel is shown.

By the laws and institutions of Leviticus the other side of the covenant is shown, that is to say, the relation of Israel towards the Lord. Therefore Leviticus is the continuation and completion of the constitution which the Lord grants unto His people.

III. The legislation contained in Numbers is the *development of the constitution especially in respect to the political administration of the theocracy*. In Numbers the laws are woven into the record of the most important events of the history of the people on their march from Sinai to the plains of Moab. Ch. 1-10 contain the preparations for the departure from Sinai and the beginning of the pilgrimage to the promised land, while ch. 11-36 report the marching in the wilderness of Paran in its three stages: 1) From Sinai to Kadesh (11-14), beginning in the second year after the exodus.* Here the occurrences are told which lead to the condemnation of forty years' wandering and dying of the present generation in the wilderness. 2) The forty years' wandering in the wilderness of Paran from Kadesh to the return of the people to this place in the first month of the fortieth year after the exodus (15-19). Only a few incidents of this period are told and the laws given in this time are recorded. The critics see here the second chasm in the history of the Pentateuch and declare that it is caused by the writer's not knowing more of this period. But the critics mistake again theme and plan of the writer of the Pentateuch. Not everything that happened in this period is of importance for the theocracy. To record such events would be inconsistent with the writer's theme and fall outside of the frame of his plan. The principal fact in this period, in the light of the writer's design, is the perishing of the generation, of the exodus and the growing up of the young generation. And by recording this the writer has done full justice to the period and his theme. 3) From Kadesh to the plains of Moab, opposite Jericho (20-36). The events

* While the chronology of Genesis is naturally connected with the life of the ancestors and patriarchs of Israel, that in the other four books is constantly founded on the chief event in the history of Israel: the exodus from Egypt. This unity of chronology shows here as well as in all other historical books, that the whole Pentateuch is worked on *one* scheme. This again creates a presumption in favor of its having been written by a single writer.

in the plains of Moab are told until the eleventh month of the fortieth year after the exodus, among them the conquest of the land east of Jordan, and the laws given in respect to the occupation of Canaan.

IV. *The confirmation of the covenant by three addresses, delivered by Moses in the plains of Moab in the eleventh month of the fortieth year (Deut. 1, 8-31, 23).* In his last address the father and lawgiver of the nation admonished the new generation grown up in the wilderness faithfully to observe the law and to adhere to the covenant which the Lord made with their fathers at Sinai.

In the first address (1, 5-4, 43), Moses surveys the history of the last forty years with the purpose to move the people to a faithful observance of the law. Now he selects three cities of refuge on the already conquered east side of Jordan.

In his second address (5-26) he repeats the ten commandments, at the base of which the covenant is concluded, and explains especially the first and the second of them. He also repeats the most important laws of the covenant, especially those contained in the Book of the Covenant, and adds new ordinances respecting the life in the promised land.

In his third address (27-30) Moses tries to win the people for the observance of the law and the renewal of the covenant by setting before them blessing and curse as consequences of observance or transgression of the law.

There is a difference concerning contents and form to be observed between the laws given at Sinai, which are recorded in Ex., Lev. and Num., and the laws in the addresses of Moses on the plains of Moab, which are contained in Deuteronomy. In the latter the laws of the other books, especially those of the Book of the Covenant, are repeated, explained, enlarged. But laws and history are not given in the objective manner of the other books, but in the form of prophetic addresses. From this difference the negative critics conclude that Deuteronomy and the other books cannot have been written by one author. But we cannot admit this conclusion. Even without the testimony of Deut. 1, 1-4, it is very probable that Moses, before his death, set before the people the sum of his legislative work and admon-

ished them to adhere to this law. When this must be admitted, it must further be admitted, not only that it could not be done but in the form of prophetic addresses of the lawgiver to the people, but also that the relation of the deuteronomic laws to the sinaitic laws cannot be otherwise than it actually is, i. e. reviewing and enlarging, the enlargements being consequences of the experience of the last forty years and especially of the fact that Israel is about to enter and to live in the promised land. It is further not to be wondered at that Moses repeats especially the laws of the Book of the Covenant, because he speaks to the people and not in the first place to the priests. The ritual laws of the other books are particularly for the use of the priests, while the Book of the Covenant and the Deuteronomy is the law-book of the people. Therefore it would not have served the purpose of Moses to repeat and impress the ritual laws upon the people, although he refers to them also in his addresses. Besides that no reasonable man will expect Moses to repeat all the ritual laws in his addresses.

Thus we see that the Deuteronomy is excellently inserted into the plan of the whole Pentateuch and renders the latter complete.

In the last chapter of the Pentateuch (Deut. 31, 1-23) Moses tells the people that his death is at hand, that Joshua is to be his successor, and makes provisions for the continual publication of the law.

In the appendix (Deut. 31, 24-34, 12) another writer affirms that Moses finished the writing of this whole Thora, and reports the death of Moses. He further adds Moses' song (ch. 32) and blessing (ch. 33) to the whole work.

Since Bleek and Ewald the negative critics affirm that the Book of Joshua was originally the key-stone of the Pentateuch, but was later separated from it. They speak, therefore of a Hexateuch instead of a Pentateuch. The argument which is said to support this affirmation is as follows: The Genesis records the Lord's promise of the possession of Canaan to the patriarchs. The writer of the pentateuchal history cannot have concluded his work without telling the fulfillment of this promise. Since this is contained in the Book of Joshua, the latter must have formed originally a part of the Pentateuch. We might easily refute this argu-

ment and show its absurdity by stating that the Pentateuch records also the promise of the Messiah. Since the N. T. books report the fulfillment, they must have been originally a part of the Pentateuch. There is as much or as little sense in this as in that. We are far from denying the close connection which actually exists between the contents of the Pentateuch and that of the Book of Joshua. But this connection is not of a kind to justify the opinion that the latter originally formed a part of the first. Again we must state that those critics mistake theme and plan of the Pentateuch. The latter is the record of the establishment of the theocracy. The history contained in the Book of Joshua is not establishment but already development of the theocracy on the foundation of the laws of the Pentateuch.

It further appears to us that the division of the Pentateuch into five (not six) books was made originally by the author. For, as we have seen already, Gen., Lev. and Deut. form each a complete whole in itself. Since by that the lines of the other two books are marked off also, the fivefold division corresponds with the plan and structure of the Pentateuch.

Our rapid survey shows that the Pentateuch has *one* theme which is strictly adhered to throughout the whole work. Everything in it relates to this theme. We have seen also that the contents of the Pentateuch are arranged and treated upon *one* plan. A book which has one theme and is worked on one plan must have been written by one author at one time. The Pentateuch itself tells us (Deut. 31) who this author is.

CITY MISSION WORK.

BY REV. J. H. SCHNEIDER, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

In all ages people have had a tendency towards the larger cities. Ninive, Babylon, Jerusalem, London are examples in evidence.

Great generals have also at all times directed their attention to these centers of population, whenever they de-

sired to subdue a country. They were well aware that if they could hold and control the cities, the surrounding country would of necessity be theirs.

While the cities are the centers of population, they are also the places where Satan puts forth his greatest efforts. He knows that sin and vice, like a plague, will grow by contact.

Our Savior, while visibly on earth, paid especial attention to the centers of population. He "went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues."

In view of the great opportunities offering in cities, in view of the great needs found there, in view also of the Lord's example, is it not surprising that the Church in general, and our synod in particular, has done so little mission work in our larger cities?

It is true, we have upwards of fifty missionaries at work. But where do we find them? By far the greater number of them are devoting their attention to smaller cities, towns, villages and rural districts. Why is this the case? One reason is found in the fact that our Lutheran people are fortunately largely given to agricultural pursuits, and must, therefore, not be sought in cities. On the other hand, we must, however, confess that we have been deterred from the large cities by the fact that it, as a rule, takes harder labor, a longer time, and much more money to gather a self-supporting congregation there than in towns and rural districts.

Has the time, however, not come when we should pay more attention to the cities? Should we not seek the centers and from these work out into the surrounding country? Should it not be our aim to be in the capital of every State and in every county seat?

Let us call to mind that of a population of perhaps sixty-five millions, no less than fifteen millions are congregated in the one hundred and twenty-four first, second and third class cities of our land. Among the people found in these cities there are certainly some Lutherans who need help. Certain it is that there are many who are not receiving any spiritual care whatever. Let us seriously ask ourselves whether, like the priest and Levite, we have not left these cities lie in their wretchedness, while we have passed by on the other side, leaving others to act the good Samari-

tan alone? Shall we continue to do so, even though some may insist upon us doing so? I hope that after giving the matter the attention it certainly deserves, every one will cheerfully and emphatically say: "Let us go in and possess the cities." A few thoughts on

CITY MISSION WORK

may not be out of place.

What is meant by city mission work? In the passage already cited, Matt. 9, 35, we are told that Jesus went about teaching and preaching, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people. Here we have a comprehensive definition of city mission work. It embraces teaching, preaching, healing, or to state it somewhat differently, it is the care for the soul and the body of those in need of help.

Of course, the teaching and preaching of the Gospel must ever occupy the first and most important place. The Word alone can convert man, no matter where he may be found. Without the preaching of the Gospel in its purity and in an abundant measure, there is no use for us entering any city. There are people enough in every city who offer highly seasoned husks to hungry souls. If we have in mind to imitate them, we had indeed better stay out of the cities. It is true, a plain Gospel sermon will cause no sensation. There will be no phenomenal crowds and miraculous growth, no lengthy newspaper reports. But there will be faith wrought, for "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." There will be some soul saved; for "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

In order, however, to get some people to hear the Gospel, it may be necessary, as in the days of Jesus on earth, that they be looked up and that their body receive some attention. City mission work requires that the erring be sought out and that the poor and the sick receive the needed care. Jesus went after the scribes and Pharisees. He found the publicans and the Magdalenes. He fed the hungry, He healed the sick, He comforted the sorrowful. In this wise He gained the attention of those who would, in all probability, have never listened to the Word. The Lord's example serve as our pattern. Of course, we are not di-

vine, our power and our means are limited. We could, however, I am certain, do much more in this direction than we are at present doing.

How can city mission work be carried on successfully? As regards the preaching of the Word, this can be done if we seek to gather congregations and to build churches where such are not found. This is more easily said than done. The starting of a sound, Lutheran congregation in a city is always attended with difficulties. Light meets opposition. Money is not willingly given. People, like sheep, love to go in crowds, even if it be to the slaughter. Yet, in spite of these difficulties, we must, if we desire to succeed in our mission work in cities, organize congregations, place pastors in charge of them and build churches. There must be a nucleus, a home, a fountain. A mere evangelistic effort is productive of very little lasting good. Paul's efforts were always directed towards establishing congregations in the cities. Though he had few souls he still did so.

In cities where there are congregations of our Church, it may become necessary to move from the center to the suburbs. Chapels should be erected; week-day and evening services could be arranged; Sunday schools, and better yet, parochial schools should be started. This may weaken the present churches, but unless it is done, the result will be that our Church will be the loser.

Systematic canvassing is also necessary. The pastor, the teachers and Sunday school teachers should, of course, do such work. They should, however, find aid in the person of every member. While it may devolve upon the pastor to go to the negligent and cold, to the backsliding and inimical, it is certainly in place for every one to invite such as may be Lutherans and such as are without a church home to services.

The press, which is such a factor in every other department of life, should not be ignored in city mission work. Proper announcements of services, even of the themes of the sermons, will aid people in learning of the existence of such a work and draw their attention to the same. Tracts and short sermons would also serve a good purpose. This plan is pursued with good results in German cities.

As regards the seeking of the erring, the care of the sick and the helping of the poor, there should be provision made in our synod for a sufficient number of deaconesses. In turn, there should be a sufficient charity fund in each city congregation to employ a deaconess. Here help could not be otherwise than beneficial. Besides, we should have hospitals in all large cities. When an unfortunate has been the recipient of help kindly bestowed at the hands, say of the Romish Church, we can't expect him or her to have a burning zeal for a church which does virtually nothing in this direction.

Instead of standing ready with a goodly supply of stones, such as have fallen into shame and disgrace should be looked up and helped up.

Poor souls who have been led into anti-Christian societies should receive especial attention. They should be dealt with earnestly, though kindly. These are some of the directions in which the city mission work must go out, if it is to be successful. There is nothing new in this. It is doing what Jesus did, it is doing what Paul and the other apostles did. Of course, the prosecution of the work along these lines requires men and women, money and property.

How can the necessary means be procured? That the means are in existence is evident from the fact that the Romish Church has them at her disposal. She builds one church, one school, one hospital, one orphanage after another in cities where the Catholics occupy the back streets. If those people have the means, why not the Lutherans? They find women who are ready to devote their services to the Church. They find teachers and nurses. If error can bring forth means and servants, why should the truth not do it much more? It did so in the early days of the Church. It certainly can do so now yet. What is wanting is a directing hand. We need more Franks and Geo. Millers, more Gossners and Louis Harms. I may say we need also a more economic use of the means which our people put at the disposal of the Church. If instead of building opposition Lutheran altars, opposition Lutheran seminaries and equipping them with the necessary men and buildings, we could turn some of these into congregational schools, into hospitals, into orphanages and homes for deaconesses, would our

Church not have more means at her disposal and would the city mission work not be in a better condition? Would not our people be more ready to give in that event? I am constrained to believe so. But until this can be consummated, we should seek to get our people to work with this in view, that we enter the cities of our land and that we extend the sphere of activity so that we may do good to the body and the soul of our brethren, seeking the eternal welfare of the soul by ministering to the temporal wants of the body, imitating our Lord and glorifying His name.

ROMANS 8, 28.

BY REV. G. DILLMANN, A. M., POSTORIA, O.

"And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose."

Happy people indeed were those early Christians, together with the Apostles. Having their full share of the ordinary ills of this present life, and being hated and persecuted on account of their faith in Jesus, they gloried in tribulations; "knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope: and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us." They knew "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us"; that if we, as heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, suffer with Him, we shall also be glorified with Him. Yea, they knew it well,—it seems to have been a household word among them, that all things, not only some things, but all things, particularly "the sufferings of this present time," work together for good to them that love God. Happy people, truly wise, real philosophers, who can thus calmly and approvingly contemplate what is so painful to the flesh—suffering, bereavement, death. It is all for their good. "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh

for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." Happy people, who can look through the present moment's light affliction to the great and eternal glory beyond.

How did those early Christians know that all things worked together for their good, for their eternal salvation and glorification? Did they fully understand God's ways and thoughts? Did they have complete survey of the whole plan of God in the moral universe? Far from it. They were as short-sighted as we are, and often their natural reason had occasion to rebel and to think God severe and unjust, especially when they, the best people on earth, were persecuted and killed all the day long, like sheep prepared for the slaughter; when death deprived the widow of her only son and support; when that fond father and mother lost their only child, and those loving sisters their only brother. They had flesh and blood, as we have. But they had faith, those early Christians had. They said, "We walk by faith, and not by sight." By faith they knew that all things worked together for their good. They believed and knew, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" Who, or what, can harm us? In view of God's love to us in Christ Jesus, could He possibly do us harm? Could He send us any real evil, or withhold any real good? "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" If God meant us harm, would He have given us His blessed Son? And having freely given us this greatest of all gifts, will He withhold from us any real good? They knew also, that what flesh and blood desire is not always good, and what gives flesh and blood pain is not always evil. By faith, and to a limited extent by experience, they knew that all things worked together for their good. No wonder they were contented and happy, and gloried in tribulations also.

We can be equally contented and happy, and glory in our tribulations, in suffering, bereavement and death, if we have faith in God; if we are content, at present, to walk by faith, and do not insist on walking by sight. If we insist on knowing the reason at once, why God sends us this or with-

holds that, we act unreasonably and become inclined to murmur and complain, or even to rebel against God's dealings with us. Only a Christian can glory in tribulation, and know that all things work together for good to them that love God. "Lord, increase our faith."

"To them that love God all things work together for good." But here's the difficulty. Am I one of those that love God? When I am under the rod, when I am sick and afflicted, when death has entered my home and taken away the dearest one, when the waters are overwhelming my soul, and the devil taunts me with the thought: "Where is now thy God?" how can I feel that I love God, or that God loves me, and that all is for my good?—You cannot feel it, perhaps; but you can know and believe it. "Have faith in God." Those early Christians did not doubt that they loved God, and that all things worked together for their good. And why not? Because they had faith in God and in God's Word. His Word says: "Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but He for our profit, that we might be partakers of His holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." That God lays the rod upon you is proof that He loves you and is doing you good.

But a still stronger proof that God loves you is, that He has called you by the Gospel to His kingdom and glory, according to His eternal purpose. Those who love God are they "that are called according to His purpose." In His infinite love God purposed to call you by the Gospel, and by this call has applied to you the grace of the Holy Spirit. Hence your love to God. "We love Him, because He first loved us." We love God, because He first loved

us in Christ Jesus, and called us by the Gospel into His kingdom. If you can truly say: "The Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with His gifts, sanctified and kept me in the true faith," be assured that this was done according to God's eternal purpose in respect to you, and that you are one of those lovers of God, or rather, one of those whom God loves, to whom all things work together for good. "Man's comfort and hope rest not upon aught that is in him, but in that which is outside of and beyond himself, namely. in God's call, expressive as it is, of God's purpose, ages before the one called came into being. As the call is the fruit of the purpose, so faith is the fruit of the call, and love the fruit of faith. To those in whom this order may be traced all things conspire for good."—Jacobs. Have you been called by the Gospel, are you a Christian, a believer, and do you, imperfectly though it be, love Him who first loved you?—then be assured that you are included among those fortunate and blessed ones, of whom the Apostle says: "And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to His purpose." "Have faith in God." He doeth all things well.

"Beloved, 'It is well!'

God's ways are always right:

And perfect love is o'er them all,

Though far above our sight."

Some day we shall see and understand it. In the meantime we must be satisfied with walking by faith, not by sight.

"Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,

But trust Him for His grace;

Behind a frowning providence

He hides a smiling face.

His purposes will ripen fast,

Unfolding ev'ry hour;

The bud may have a bitter taste,

But sweet will be the flower.

Blind unbelief is sure to err,

And scan His work in vain;

God is His own interpreter,

And He will make it plain."

BIBLICAL RESEARCH NOTES.**ASPECTS OF MODERN BIBLICAL RESEARCH.**

The Bible is in our own day and date the cynosure of all eyes. Bible study, both in its strictly scientific as also in its popular phases, is exceedingly popular. Biblical problems are largely in the forefront of the public interests of the times. The discovery of new data in the ruins of Egypt or the Euphrates valley that tend to throw new light on the Scriptures is sure to arouse a widespread interest among general readers, as well as among Bible students. A new literary find, such as the Logia of Christ, only whets the general appetite for further research of this kind.

This popularity has become all the wider and deeper because all the nations of Christendom are practically co-operating in the solution of Biblical problems. Cosmopolitanism is characteristic of learned research in our day in general in every department and particularly in the investigation of the Scriptures. The Biblical research is in our generation international. Virtually the same questions are engaging the attention of Bible students everywhere, and the investigations and researches of one country or of one scholar readily become the common property of Bible students everywhere and contribute materially toward making modern research in this department one of unity of purpose, methods and results. Not even in the Middle Ages, when the Latin constituted the common language of intercommunication between the scholars of various nations and climes, was the exchange and the interchange of learned research, particularly in reference to the Scriptures, such as it is now. All this conspires to make Bible work a prominent factor in the intellectual life and activity of our times.

Probably a deeper reason for this prominence lies in the fact that the methods of modern Bible research are in close and sympathetic touch and tone with the ideas and ideals of scholarship in general that characterize the work of our day. In all branches and departments of investigation the historic method has become the most potent and powerful fact. The idea of historical development predominates in the scientific research of the day. Historical studies,

in the wide sense of the term, have expanded wonderfully and have been prolific of the greatest changes in the conception and treatment of nearly every prominent branch of scientific investigation. The Bible has rendered itself all the more pliable to the canons and ideals of this method, because here as scarcely anywhere else the process of development as an all-important factor was acknowledged on all hands. Conservative and advanced students agree in this, that the Scriptures are also the history of a revelation; that the whole and entire truth was not revealed from the outset, but were gradually unfolded as the purposes and wishes of God determined. To the present day yet there is perfect agreement on the part of historical developments in the unfolding of God's plan and ways in the Scriptures, the disagreement between the schools being in reference to the factors and forces that were active in the gradual process of development. The newer and critical school, with a more or less pronounced naturalistic trend, see in this development chiefly or entirely only the unfolding of natural and national interests and capabilities of the religiously richly endowed people of Israel, while the conservative at the various stages of this development recognize the finger of God and the special interference and guidance of the 'Great Jehovah. But the fact of such a development in the history recorded in the sacred canon is accepted on all hands; and this fact explains why the new branch of Biblical Theology, or the presentation of the various types of teaching as represented by the different writers of the Old and New Testament, has so rapidly become a fixed fact in modern Bible work. In this respect too there is a marked contrast to the methods and manners of former generations, who had no eyes or feeling apparently for this historical side of the Scriptures, but were accustomed to regard them largely as a codex of dicta probantia, or proof passages, for specific doctrines and dogmas. Their strong and their weak sides consisted in the almost exclusive emphasis laid upon the divine side of revelation, while the strong and the weak side of modern Scriptural research consists in the marked prominence assigned to the human side.

This latter distinction and difference also explains other characteristics of modern Biblical research. Among these

is the special interest shown in the religious and political ups and downs of those peoples with whom Israel came into contact or with whom Israel was kith and kin. The religious development of Israel being now regarded largely as a part and portion of a still larger historical process, the connection between Israel's religious teachings and tenets and those of other peoples becomes a problem of considerable interest, no matter how the agreement or disagreement between them may be explained. This, too, explains another feature of this kind, which is probably a leading weakness of the Biblical research of our day, namely, that it devotes itself so largely to the externals of the Scriptures to the seeming neglect at least of what is really the heart and the kernel of revelation, namely, the doctrines of salvation. Questions of history, of archæology, of antiquities, of chronology, of literary relation and connection, such as the Pentateuchal and the synoptic problems, and the like are largely in the foreground of interest and study, while the deeper and more important matters of doctrines and teachings are not to the same degree the center of investigation. It cannot be said, that with all the Biblical research of our generation any leading doctrine of Scripture has received to a material degree new light and interpretation. This claim can be put forth only by those who accept the reconstruction of Old Testament religious history as proposed by the Wellhausen school; and against this so strong a reaction has set in that its days may soon be numbered, at any rate in its present form and spirit, and that it may soon be destined to become company to that rejected twin relic of ultra-criticism, the New Testament school of Baur of Tübingen.

GERMAN PALESTINE SOCIETY.—It is doubtful whether there is another learned association in existence that with so small means has accomplished such excellent results as the German Palestine Society, with headquarters at Leipzig. The recent publication of its reports, in synopsis, from the year of establishment in 1878 down to the close of 1897, draws renewed attention to this work. The official name of the organization is "Der deutsche Verein zur Erforschung Palästinas." It publishes two journals, one, called "Zeit-

schrift", devoted entirely to strictly scientific researches; and a second, entitled "Mittheilungen und Nachrichten", of a more popular character, furnishing reliable news concerning the ups and downs of Palestine research. The former was for many years in charge of Professor Guthe, of Leipzig, but is now edited by Lic. Dr. Benzinger, while Guthe has taken the editorial management of the second. The membership of the society includes the great bulk of German university professors in the Old and New Testament departments, not only of Germany, but also of Austria and Switzerland, while foreign countries are also reasonably well represented. There is but one honorary member, namely, the indefatigable Architect Schick, of Jerusalem, also the most industrious contributor to both periodicals of the association. The Verein does not aim primarily at original and new investigations, although some good work in this direction has been done under its auspices by Consul Schumacher, of Haifa, and others, but at a thorough, scientific sifting and study of the mighty mass of Palestine matter not yet satisfactorily investigated. The publisher of its journals is K. Bædeker, of Leipzig.

Among the special New Testament exegetical problems at present under discussion probably none other equals in interest and importance that which aims to determine the original purpose of the Lord's Supper. Professor Jülicher, Marburg, was the first to defend the view that originally it was not intended to be a memorial rite, but that its purpose was changed to this effect by the early teachers of the Church. The line of argument is interesting, and at the same time instructive in showing how and in what manner critically inclined investigators often make remarkable blunders. There are four accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper, viz. Matt. 26, 26, 27; Mark 14, 22-24; Luke 22, 19, 20; 1 Cor. 11, 23-25. No two of these agree throughout. Yet a comparison shows that Matthew and Mark show a close agreement, as also do Luke and St. Paul. As Paul wrote as early as 57 A. D., there can be no doubt that Luke got his account from Paul. Yet between the Matthew-Mark account, and the Luke-Paul account there is a noteworthy difference. Especially is it remarkable that in the Matthew-Mark report the words "Do this

in remembrance of me" are lacking. In deciding which of these two double narratives can claim historical priority, Jülicher decides that the Matthew-Mark report reproduces the Lord's sayings—the most reliable and correct form. It is true that these Gospels were not written until 70-80 after Christ, but they are based upon written documents (*Aufzeichnungen*) that were prepared soon after the first Pentecost; and we have here the oldest reports, practically going back to 30-40 A. D. The fact that in this account the words mentioned are not found is regarded as proof that Christ did not intend originally to establish the Lord's Supper as a memorial rite, or as a permanent arrangement in the Church. Paul himself did not add these words. He found them in use in the Church, they having been added when the Church awakened to the consciousness that Christ's second coming to judgment could not be expected in the near future. Jülicher has found decided opposition in the liberal ranks themselves. Especially has Professor Kattenbusch, of Giessen, in the *Christliche Welt*, on critical grounds shown that the new views are untenable. Of course the whole conservative Church opposes the innovation as a man.

A GEOLOGIST ON THE DESTRUCTION OF SODOM.

Of the sixty-four pages composing the last issue of the "Journal" of the German Palestine Society, Vol. XIX, No. 1, no less than fifty-nine are filled by a single article on the subject of the "Origin and History of the Dead Sea" (*"Entstehung und Geschichte des Todten Meeres"*), by Dr. Max Blanckenhorn, a geologist from the University of Erlangen, containing the results of special researches undertaken at the expense of the society itself. The article is accompanied by four full-page maps and eight smaller illustrations, and the whole offers more new facts and data to the square inch than is generally done even by exceptionally good discussions. The bulk of the article is of a technical geological character, yet furnishes a mass of instructive reading for Bible students who are not specialists in the geology of Palestine. Toward the close of his discussion the author enters upon questions of special interest to the lover of the

Word, and we, accordingly, condense what he says on these points, which is substantially the following:

The destruction of the oldest seats of civilization and culture in the Jordan Valley and the Dead Sea districts, namely that of the four cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, is one of the fixed facts of earliest tradition, and for the critical geologist the phenomenon presents no difficulty, as far as it can be traced at all. The tragedy was caused by a sudden break of the valley basin in the southern part of the Dead Sea, resulting in the sinking of the soil, a phenomenon which, without any doubt, was in intimate connection with a catastrophe in nature, or an earthquake accompanied by such sinking of the soil along one or more rents in the earth, whereby these cities were destroyed or "overturned," so that the Salt Sea now occupies their territory. The view that this sea did not exist at all before this catastrophe, or that the Jordan before this period flowed into the Mediterranean Sea, contradicts throughout all geological and natural science teachings concerning the formation of this whole region.

There is no reason to accept the hypothesis that a volcanic eruption or a volcanic outbreak of the soil of any kind took place under the feet of the Sodomites, as is taught by Næthling in his "*Das Todte Meer*," 1886, nor for believing that a burning lava stream destroyed these cities. Much more of a real question is the view that at that time only the northern and larger portion of the Dead Sea, which is 399 meters deep, actually sunk beneath the surrounding surface. But even this view is not acceptable, as such a later origin of the Northern Sea would have made a sharper difference between the later terraces of the sea. The fact of the matter is that the difference between the lower terraces and the upper is so slight as to preclude the possibility of this hypothesis. Probably the catastrophe to which the account in Genesis refers was comparatively small in extent and consisted in the sinking of the former southern banks to the extent of about 100 meters in depth. The waters that then rolled over these cities could in the course of time have produced the formation of the banks and surroundings that now exists. Probably the northern and larger half of the Dead Sea

existed already at the time when Sodom was destroyed, while the space now occupied by the southern and smaller half, which is only from one to six meters deep, extending from the Lisân peninsula southward was, previous to this catastrophe, fertile bottom land, the edge of the valley of Siddim. Among other things, the presence of asphalt in the neighborhood of the southern part of the sea speaks for this view as to the position of the valley of Siddim with its pitch deposits (cf. Josh. 2, 1 and 3, 1; Joel 3, 23). That the Pentapolis at one time was situated in the southern part of the Dead Sea, which is now called Sebcha, is proved also, among other things, by the probable location at this place of Zoar, the place which escaped destruction in the days of Lot; in accordance, too, with the writers of antiquity and of the Middle Ages, including the Arabian geographers. As yet nothing certain can be determined concerning the location of the four other cities, viz.: Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, of which names only that of Sodom in "Djebel Usdum," is found reflected in any place in these precincts. And even apart from geological and geographical reasons, this seems to be the natural thing, as the Book of Genesis represents these places as having been thoroughly destroyed without leaving trace or remnant behind. The fact that now these districts are a dreary waste, and by the Arabian geographer Mukaddasi called a "hill," is no evidence that in earlier times this was not different, and this valley not really a vision of paradise.

The destruction of the Sodomite plain by an earthquake, is attested not only by the Old Testament, but also by Greek and Roman authors, in full harmony with the account given in Genesis. The author of this deeply interesting article closes with these words:

"In this way many of the riddles that are offered by the peculiar character of the Dead Sea and its surroundings are satisfactorily solved. Then, too, all the phenomena of nature which the Book of Genesis describes as taking place in connection with the catastrophe of Sodom, the last and only one of the kind experienced by man in the historical period, I think has been explained sufficiently in the preceding discussion."

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XVIII.

JUNE, 1898.

No. 3.

LIBERTY AND THE REFORMATION.

BY REV. PROFESSOR M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, O.

Every year the "progress" of man under the reign of advanced science that refuses to recognize God becomes more marked. The intellect is struggling to adapt itself to the forces that are acting upon it. Darkness and death are claiming and finding recognition. In the more pronounced circles of enlightenment and evolution not only is the old faith of the Scriptures that preach Christ and afford peace renounced and contemptuously cast aside as a fable for illiterates, but even the law that is given by Moses and expounded by our Savior, which even infidels in former times respected, is depreciated and discarded. This fact adds a new problem for philosophical ethics. We do not propose here to discuss it. Our object now is simply to note it as a downward step in the "descent" of man under evolutionary auspices, and as an indication of human possibilities without God.

The clamor of many in our day is for liberty in the sense of absolute freedom from all authority. The theory advanced is that man's normal condition is that in which there is no restriction put upon his pleasure, in which he is alone lord, and in which no one molests him in the execution of his own sweet will. He wants no restraint put upon him from without, and would do away with any check that might be put upon him from within. No authority, divine or human, is to interfere with his choice of ends and his means of attaining them. Not even conscience is to have

a voice in directing or correcting his method of self-gratification. It is pitiful in the extreme that things have come to the desperate pass of renouncing all morality as well as all religion. It shows how brutish humanity may become when the evolution of enmity to God is unrestrained.

The liberty which the great Lutheran Reformation of the 16th century preached is appealed to by such libertines, as it has often been appealed to by liberalists of a less radical sort. Man is a responsible creature, and each individual has a personal responsibility of his own. The rights of each must be recognized and maintained. This the Reformation established, and the history of nations and of the world has been largely shaped by it ever since. And now people shout themselves hoarse for the liberty achieved through the most momentous struggle of time, and think themselves in harmony with the great movement in the assertion of human rights, though they renounce the authority by which alone such rights are secured or can be maintained against tyranny in every form.

In the controversies of the Lutheran Church with Liberalism and Unionism the appeal of our opponents to the great reformatory principle of liberty has often been effective in arousing passion and creating prejudice against us. Even to this day, notwithstanding the light that has been shed on the subject, some still ignore the truth and continue to mislead the ignorant by urging liberty instead of truth. Is it not a sorrowful sight to see, when men who have had ample opportunities to inform themselves and who even call themselves Lutheran, make the great principle of the Reformation to consist in the liberty of believing what you please and, what must in consistency follow, doing what you please? The liberty for which the liberalists in religion clamor is exactly the liberty for which the libertines in morals clamor, and the appeal of the one for justification to the principles of the Reformation is just as stupid and just as outrageous as the other. It would be a mercy of God if some by the absurdities of men who on the plea of liberty reject all moral obligation would be brought to see the sin of rejecting all religious authority on the same plea. Let us look at this subject of liberty.

1. The Bible admonishes us to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Gal. 5, 1. Let due stress be laid on the definition which the Scriptures give. We ask this because the world is prone to misunderstand the whole case. It can not be expected to do otherwise, because just as soon as freedom is mentioned human reason applies its own norm. It cannot do otherwise. When man under the influence of nature thinks at all, it is in accord with the impulses and motives that lie in his own heart. He can not think and feel and will in other ways than his own nature suggests and prompts. The motive of his action is in himself. Ultimately that motive is always the sinful inclination of his heart, whatever may be the actions of his will. These may conform, or they may not conform, to the conception of right; they are in either case in accord with the desires of the heart. And when a man by the grace of God becomes a Christian, so that other motives than those which flow from his corrupt nature direct his thoughts and volitions, he is never absolutely safe against the influence of sin that still resides in his flesh, though it has been reduced to subjection. It must therefore not seem surprising that the cry for liberty is not infrequently a wild clamor for license to think and do as the flesh may dictate, and that not only unbelievers, with whom this must be regarded as a matter of course, raise and sustain the cry, but that also some weak Christians, who ought to be better informed and better directed, join in the clamor and aid the confusion. Liberty is so dear to our hearts, especially to the hearts of the American people, that it seems like defying common sense when any query or any caution is suggested in that respect. But it is in the interest of liberty that we speak when we urge the inspired rule to hold fast the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. If you have it not, see that you get it; if you have it, see that you hold it fast.

The truth which all men should realize, but which only the true followers of the gospel, whose light the Reformation restored to the world, duly appreciate, is that which our blessed Lord expressed in the words: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John

8, 31. 32. Liberty is precious, but we get at the root of the matter only when we realize the liberty of the children of God, who are such by faith in Christ Jesus, and who are free through the truth which proclaims it. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." 2 Cor. 3, 17.

No misunderstanding, perhaps we would better say, no misrepresentation, of the Reformation could be more radical than that which appeals to it as a liberation from all restraints on individual desires — from all restraints personal or social, political or ecclesiastical. It is a mistake similar to that of the leading Romish prelate in this land, who charged Luther with being revolutionary in his reformatory work because he did not seek to reform popery by submitting to the power of popery, but made war on the enthroned Antichrist instead of indulging the absurd hope that in due time the Antichrist would abdicate in favor of the Christ. The broad-minded, whole-souled Reformer never for a moment indulged the stupid, miserable thought that man is an independent creature that can do just as he pleases and can fulfill his mission and reach his goal and be happy in doing his own will and following the impulses of his own sinful heart. On the contrary, that was exactly the point against which his war was largely waged. He would not submit to the pope because the pope would not submit to God. What did all this mean? Why, that because the Lord alone, as He speaks by His Word, is Monarch of the universe, he would not be a slave to usurpers, who presumed to lord it over him and over all people. He would not be subject to those usurpers, because the Lord had made him free from such yokes of bondage and had required him to assert his freedom to the glory of his Redeemer. The case is not hard to understand. Because Christ alone is Lord, the pope cannot be. I am free if I serve the Lord; I am a slave if I serve another, who arrogates to himself the Lord's prerogative and binds me where the Lord has not bound me. We are free when we subject ourselves to God, who made us for happiness in His service; we cannot otherwise than be slaves when we renounce Him and subject ourselves to usurpers whose selfishness forbids them to care for us except so far as we are in subservience to their interests; and who have not the

power to compass our happiness if they did care, because we were created for God, not for them. Therefore the idea of freedom from the authority of God is not only foreign from all the guiding principles of the Reformation, but is subversive of its entire foundation. It has nothing in common with the frantic pranks of professed reformers, though they may call themselves Protestants, who claim the liberty to make hogs of themselves, to disturb all society on the plea that their own pleasure is their only law, to overthrow governments because these interfere with their licentiousness, and to undermine the Church because this upholds divine law and order and restricts their so-called liberty of trampling truth and righteousness under their despotic feet.

2. The liberty which the Reformation secured upholds all divine law and order, and guarantees it for all men. It does this on its fundamental principle that God alone is Lord, and that to Him alone the whole creation is subject; but only to Him. One man is not of himself master over another man. The rights of all are the same, because all are alike subject to the same divine authority. The sons and daughters have equal claims with the father and mother to all the privileges that belong to humanity; the citizen has equal claims with the king or the president to all the powers and immunities which God has by creation conferred on the human race; the layman in the Church possesses all the rights and powers that God has conferred on Christian people, and is accordingly on a complete equality with the clergy, be they called pastor or priest or pope. This might seem the proclamation of a liberty that is destruction of all order and that must result in anarchy. And so some have ignorantly understood it, or maliciously represented it. But it can seem so only to those who in their eagerness for liberty, or in their desire to utilize the love of it for their private ends, overlook or endeavor to conceal the fundamental principle on which it rests; namely, that because God alone is Lord no man shall lord it over his fellowman. What if the son is better educated than his father, and therefore in that respect may even be recognized by the neighbors as his superior — does that do away with God's law that we shall honor our father

and mother? In the ordinance of God the parents are superiors still, even if their children excel them in many a gift and many an attainment. The trouble in our modern family life is not at all that the liberty for which the Reformation struggled, and for which its advocates suffered, has borne bitter fruits and emancipated the children from what they often in our land contemptuously call their "governors", but that the glorious liberty of the gospel, which renders souls thankfully and heartily subject to the will of the Lord, has been thanklessly rejected or neglected. Where a child has any appreciation at all of the immunity which it enjoys from the despotic interference with its duties and its pleasures by the arrogant assumptions of neighbors presuming to exercise control over it, how could it possibly, even though its mental powers were very moderate, give place to the fancy that its liberty from such domination exempts it from the duty of subjection to its parents, when the only law of God that binds it to this subjection is all that it has to support its freedom from all such usurpations? Only God rules, and therefore only those whom He appoints to be head of the house can have any authority in our homes. If His authority is not recognized, there is nothing but despotic arrogance and miserable slavery to those who are the most powerful and most skillful in enforcing their will.

And what is true in regard to family government is equally true of the extension of families into what we call states or nations. Nothing could be more absurd than to suppose that the equality of all makes everybody the lord over his fellowman, or that the liberty from human domination makes it right to pursue one's own will though the wills of millions of our fellowmen should be overridden in the pursuit. It is not possible that there should be any government in which the rights of all are equally recognized, unless God, who is over all alike and to whom all men alike are subject, should Himself institute the office of government. Otherwise there could be nothing but anarchy, even though sometimes there should by some usurper's success be a season of rest from the turmoil and confusion which it brings. God has instituted civil government for His intelligent creatures' good, as He has done

all things well. The Holy Spirit has declared by the apostle: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." Rom. 13, 1. 2. The great principle of liberty from all human usurpations of authority by which men seek to enslave their fellowmen, was based, as it alone could be based, on the exclusive authority of God, whom alone we are to serve, and in whose service alone we can be free from the arrogance of men who would reduce us to base servitude under those who are only our equals and who have no authority over us.

The great principle of liberty is not a mere negation. It is not only a denial of one man's right to enslave another man. It is a positive assertion of the authority of God, with the plain implication that there can be no rights in conflict with this authority and that no claims can be allowed which would set that authority aside. Therefore the liberty which the reformation proclaims is the profoundest antithesis to all anarchistic and socialistic theories and schemes, and the most earnest protest against all assertions of license against the will of the Lord. What is meant is not that the civil government must adopt the law of the Lord as the fundamental constitution of the State and regulate its legislation by this rule. Christianity has revealed no constitution and code of laws for the civil government's guidance, so as to render all constitutional conventions and all legislative assemblies superfluous. But it has made known the will of God in regard to States, as it has in regard to individuals, and has made known the principle on which alone any national government can stand and on which alone human liberty can be maintained. It has shown that God rules over all, and that He alone is supreme. It has shown us that when we recognize His ordinances, man's peace and comfort is secured and evils that otherwise threaten us are avoided. But therefore it has made it clear to us that freedom from the bondage of tyrants and usurpers is found only in subjection to the rightful Ruler of heaven and earth. Those who pursue anarchistic and communistic and socialistic schemes, under the plea that they are carrying out the Reformation prin-

ciple of liberty, are either very ignorant of all that the Reformation meant, or very bold in their presumption that only the few have any knowledge of its fundamental principles, and that the many will be deceived by the very sound of the word liberty and will fall into line at the sound without any regard to a higher power that alone can secure the substance. What the Reformation proclaims is the liberty in Christ to serve the living God, and therefore, as regards civil government, the liberty to renounce all the powers but those which God has set over us. For the wild cry of liberty to serve the flesh and the devil and thus to disturb all social order and all civil government, the Reformation has no responsibility, because the liberty which it declared and defended is the true liberty, the only liberty which is not ultimately slavery under this sweet name; to wit, the liberty to serve our God according to His Word, without subjection to men who usurp authority that belongs only to Him.

As to the Church the same liberty exists, only that an important distinction must be made. In the family and in the state the Lord has established a government by giving special powers to parents and rulers. They are to issue commands to their subjects and these are to obey. The rule of righteousness is to be their guide. But they are to exercise their judgment as to what is expedient, and therefore as to what, being right, is best under the circumstances. They are never authorized to thwart the will of Him who has instituted their office and by whose institution alone they have any authority. But they have scope for the exercise of their own power of judgment within the sphere of right. Two parents may differ in this regard; two rulers may judge differently in respect to a special need. They have the right to decide, and their decision is binding. This is not because there is authority in one man's nature or person over another man, but because God has instituted governments and commanded us to be subject to those whom He has set over us. We must obey the rulers, because God has so ordained. But in the Church there are no such rulers as parents and magistrates are in the family and in the State, because this is God's kingdom, whose interests are too

great to leave to any human decision. What we must believe in order to be saved, and what we must do to please God, we can be sure of only when God Himself tells us. Men cannot save us, and therefore they cannot prescribe what must be believed unto salvation; they cannot make the way of life. Men are not the judges to whom our final account is to be rendered, and therefore it boots us nothing to know what they want and to do what they demand. The parents and the magistrates are required to do right, but the specifications of right as they are needed in the daily life and changing circumstances of families and nations can safely be left to the judgment of those who by the ordinance of God are the constituted authorities. But in matters of salvation and of conscience no such discretionary power is given to men, and none can be recognized. God has appointed no authority in the Church that is empowered to dictate to men what they must believe unto salvation and what they must do to live righteously. The summit of Antichristian arrogance is reached in the claim of papal infallibility, which was a power for evil in Luther's day, but which has become intensified to a degree that is satanic in the threat of damnation to every soul that will not bow down and worship this image of proud man's contrivance. Christ rules in the Church, and in no case and under no circumstances will He give His glory to another. He has prepared the way of salvation in all its particulars. He has left nothing for man to do, so that the power of it and the glory of it could in any way be divided. He alone is Savior and He alone is Lord. How could He then, desiring to save our poor souls and knowing that He alone can save them, leave it to man's benighted mind to devise and teach a way of salvation? The thing is preposterous, and should seem insulting and disgusting to all Christian people. In mercy He means to rule His kingdom Himself, and He does so by His Word. To that we must appeal. If any speak not according to that Word, they speak to true Christians in vain, because these know their Shepherd's voice and will not follow the voice of a stranger. They are bound by the Word of God; they are bound by nothing else; that is their liberty. Being purchased with a price, they will not be slaves of men, as they

will no longer be slaves of the devil, the usurping prince of this world.

3. This principle of liberty could not otherwise than shape the course of nations as well as of individuals. It was often misunderstood in the days of Luther, and has often been misunderstood since. The unhappy Peasants' War, against which Luther applied the same word of the Lord which he had directed against the usurpations of the pope, shows how truth in the hands of men that do not understand its import and are impervious to its power may by their fault lead to disaster, just as a dire apprehension of freedom from the law has led thousands, in their confusion and perversion, to justify the licentiousness which was born of the flesh, and in no sense and in no degree of the gospel and its glorious liberty. The Reformation is not responsible for anarchistic notions in home or State or Church. Its fundamental principle is the exclusive authority, the exclusive power, and the exclusive glory of God. He alone is Lord. Under Him we are free. There was reason for asserting this freedom as well in civil as in ecclesiastical affairs, as it implied individual liberty in every respect. "The truth shall make you free" in all relations, because it shall make persons free who stand in these various relations. But that which makes you free is the truth: abandon that, and there is nothing but the slavery into which Satan led our race and which he upholds and perpetuates by utilizing the spurious wisdom of fallen man in the interest of his nefarious schemes.

How then does the matter stand in regard to civil liberty? Is the teaching of the Bible and of the Reformation this, that every man is his own master and can do as he pleases in his relations to God and his fellowmen, doing what is good in his own eyes and renouncing all authority that demands what does not suit his inclination or taste or whim? In the blindness of their hearts many have thought so, and revolutionary principles and anarchistic and communistic follies have been the result in many a darkened understanding and many a wild exploit. That revolution and confusion and insecurity of life and property have been the consequence of such perversions of the truth under the dominion of the flesh is natural enough; but it is the gross-

est injustice to impute the licentiousness of the flesh to the liberty of the Spirit which the Reformation preached.

What the Reformation did maintain, and in the hearts of believers did secure, was the grand truth that God alone is Lord, and that the soul in subjection to Him is free from all other dominion and therefore from every yoke of bondage imposed by usurpers. As regards civil government this would not be without influence on human thought. It led some and still leads some to find in it an excuse for the lawless violence with which they set themselves against divinely constituted authorities, because these constituted authorities do not conform to their judgment or their preference. The question that presents itself in cases like this is that of authority to decide. Political wisdom has made it clear that courts of justice, in which men disinterested in the particular case would be appointed to decide, should be obeyed. Why? If the appeal is to the rights of man, each interested individual will naturally judge in his own favor. Who then shall decide? "The powers that be are of God." They must give the decision. Not that those who occupy the offices in the government are better than we, or that they are even wiser than we, although any reasonable mind will conclude that a disinterested party will be more likely to find the just measure and to apply it fairly than a party that is antecedently determined by its own interest. The appeal can therefore only be to the divinely constituted authority. As between man and man, who have equal rights, the government must judge. That has divine authority to rule, and if that should be supposed to err or should really err, it has divine authority still, and its error can be remedied only by showing its error and bringing the light of truth and righteousness to bear upon it and correct it, never by revolutionary efforts to overthrow the divine ordinance and reducing men to the slavery of human passion and lawless power. Our liberty rests on the recognition of the divine institution of civil government and the consequent obedience to law as the divinely constituted expression of the divine will, even though in some cases this may not be in perfect harmony with the divine plan and order of righteousness. There can be no liberty where divine order is overthrown. That can only result in subjec-

tion to the force of human power and human passion, and of human ambition to exalt itself.

But there is another matter that requires consideration in this relation. The Word of God not only teaches us that there are divine ordinances for the government of this world, but also that the divinely constituted governments have their own sphere and consequently their appropriate limitations. The powers that be in the civil government are of God. The Reformation recognized this, and the Church of the Reformation has never ceased to recognize it. But it does not follow that the State may regulate the affairs of the individual conscience or control the affairs of the Church. This the Church of the Reformation never could admit.

For, in the first place, God has appointed to the State its own sphere and domain, and has given it no authority beyond that. It is designed for this world, and has no office in the saving of souls from the damnation of hell, or regulating the relations of these souls to God. It has no means of grace committed to its charge and no calling in regard to the administration of such means as are committed to the other divine institutions of the Church. It always has enough to do when it attends to its own calling. To it is committed the sword, not the gospel. If men will not obey the powers that be in the civil government, they must be coerced. The government cannot bandy with criminals and listen to appeals to love and evangelical liberty. It has nothing to do with that. Be that as it may, it decides what righteousness requires, and enforces its decision by the power of the sword. The policeman has no right to neglect his business and waste his time in discussing the question whether the arrests which he makes are charitable or evangelical. He can not change the statute, and in no circumstances has he the right to nullify or ameliorate the law which he is appointed to execute. Nor can the citizen, who may disagree with the legislature as to what righteousness requires, at all complain when the law is enforced; because that is precisely what he would demand if his convictions of right and expediency were embodied in law. If the judgment of legislators is against him, he has the same reason to submit to the inevitable as

the successful lawmakers would have had if his judgment had prevailed. If the matter is one which legitimately belongs to the legislature, it would be tyrannical on his part to claim exclusive jurisdiction and endeavor to force the government, against its own conviction of right as expressed in the law, to submit to his will. If his judgment seems to him essential for the welfare of the State, let him use all the power of reason and right to have this adopted in the legitimate way of legislation and then rightfully enforced. And if the matter is one that seems to him not a mere question of human judgment, but of divine right, so that in his estimation the government has transcended its divinely imparted power and has meddled with the rights of individual conscience, he can raise his solemn protest against the usurpation, peremptorily refuse obedience to any sin commanded, and suffer any punishment that on this account may be laid upon him; or, if the way is open to him, leave the country which allows no exercise of the liberty divinely given to man. The remedy for human usurpations is a different matter and may often be hard to find, because men will not always listen to reason or regard righteousness; but the great principle of civil liberty is plain, that states have no authority and no calling to meddle in matters pertaining to faith and conscience, and that they can impose no obligations in this regard, because God has reserved this to Himself. His Word regulates this, and no power else has authority to regulate it.

In the second place, the State has not the power necessary to render any legislation in the sphere of faith and conscience possible. Those who presume that the civil government is designed to furnish laws in this sphere and to enforce them are devising vain, because impossible things. If a man steals his neighbor's property or destroys his neighbor's life, he does what the government can see, and can know to be inconsistent with the peace and the welfare of the community. The government can therefore forbid this wrong, and can punish the wrong-doer in the interest of maintaining common rights and of protecting individuals in the enjoyment of these rights. But it cannot know the motives of men, and has no reason to inquire into them otherwise than as the judgment of the heinous-

ness of the offence, perhaps it would be better to say as to the dangerousness of the person who commits the offence, is concerned. It is not possible that courts of justice should decide as to the state of the heart. They may take the intention as manifested in the deed and in the circumstances of the deed so far into the account as to modify their judgment as to the enormity of the crime committed, and may on that account be led to modify the punishment of the crime. With good reason the courts are usually granted such power. But it is radically wrong on that account to allege that the courts are appointed to pronounce their judgment according to the ethical motive, not according to the act. If a man commits adultery or murder because that seems to him the best thing to do under the circumstances, the best thing being determined by the personal desire and personal interest involved and the individual will in the case, the law that forbids adultery and murder will not by reasonable men be understood to mean that a lustful man may commit adultery or a revengeful man may commit murder because in their condition that was the natural thing to do. The question for the court would be whether the law has been violated, whatever mitigating circumstances may appear of which the judges may make account, within the limits of their discretionary power in pronouncing the sentence. The legislators can make no distinction between adultery committed on Mormon principles and adultery committed on Pagan principles: the fact of adultery is all that concerns them. They cannot make a distinction between murder committed from alleged motives of conscience and manifest motives of gain. If it is adultery or murder as the human understanding sees it and the law defines it, the alleged motive, which may seem to the culprit right, but which the common judgment as declared in the law pronounces wrong, there is no way but that the courts, which are to enforce the law, should declare the legal punishment against the guilty. Neither the legislature nor the executive nor the court can read the heart, nor in the ordinance of God appointing "the powers that be" is there any requirement that the heart should be read and the punishment of transgression meted out accordingly. Man cannot do that. Whether man means

well or ill when he steals his neighbor's property is not at all the question when the law that declares theft a crime is to be enforced. The government recognizes the fact that another's property has been stolen, and the law against theft must be enforced. Whether the thief can yet be justified by faith and be acquitted before the bar of God through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the civil government has no means of knowing, and has no calling to concern itself about it. The State has not the authority to undertake the impossible work of proving our hearts and of deciding on our faith and conscience, and can therefore never with its legislation reach deeper down than the overt act. It can make laws, but whether the citizen's obedience is from good or evil motives is not at all its business, if only obedience is rendered; and on the same ground as a matter of principle it is none of its business whether the transgression of promulgated law be by a subjectively good or by an evil motive. If the plain law is violated, the annexed punishment must follow. No claims of good intention in the doing of manifest wrong can be allowed. The legislature and the court cannot judge the heart or make laws and decisions in this respect. They can only judge the outward life, and more than this God has not appointed them to do. They are in the nature of things confined to this. The Reformation has taught the people that there is no Lord over conscience but God, and in proportion as its principles have gained the ascendancy in the world, right has ruled the nations and consciences have been free.

4. This liberty is a boon which we should prize and maintain. It is not a small matter, the loss of which would be a slight inconvenience and nothing more. Even in regard to the State this would be an error fraught with misery. But it is not in this regard that the danger is greatest. Indeed, in respect to civil government and citizenship it is often the extreme against which a warning voice must be raised. There liberty but too often runs into licentiousness, because souls cut themselves loose from the authority and government of God. The result is necessarily the loss of all liberty and all power to achieve it. Whether we will it or not, we must be under the dominion of men if we will

not be under the dominion of God, and such human rule, without the recognition of God's supremacy, who maintains all righteousness and resists all unrighteousness of men, must always be tyrannical.

No doubt many who are not in a condition to appreciate the design and service of the Church have valued highly the liberty which it proclaims and have profited by it. Even infidels have often accepted the results of the Reformation without being at all capable of placing a true estimate upon that great work or realizing its profound import for humanity. The rights of man have frequently been urged and maintained by men who were slaves of Satan and had no rights at all. The explanation of the curious condition lies in the great truth which the Reformation brought again to the notice of men, that God alone rules, and that therefore all men as His subjects are equal in their subjection. None has superiority over the other, except so far as the Lord of all appoints one over the other. It is easily explained how the equality of man could be intellectually sundered from the sovereignty of God, and how in consequence the latter would be accentuated without a recognition, or at least without a due appreciation, of the former. Freedom from the domination of individual will would thus be maintained only on the ground that all are equal, and therefore one has no more right to rule than another unless by common consent. The flaw in such argument is obvious, because the fact is patent that one man is naturally more highly gifted than another, and he may therefore not only assert his superiority in fact by usurping power, but maintain it by the submission and adherence of his followers who recognize the fact. Security against such dangers is obtainable only by accepting the truth that God alone is Sovereign, and we are all equal because we are all equally subject to His ordinances. This guards against all licentiousness and secures the largest liberty that is possible in our social state, and especially guarantees liberty of conscience, over which God alone rules and has constituted no human authority.

To this the Church forms no exception. On the contrary, the Church is the teacher of the truth which makes us free. No error could be more grievous than that of as-

suming that we must have liberty of conscience in the State, but not in the Church. It is only because of the gospel which rules in the Church, and which the Reformation again brought to light, that we have liberty at all. Should the Church then be so forgetful of her own treasure as to discard it in her own sphere? She is free, and the truth which she possesses proclaims liberty. She is free, because the Lord, to whom by divine grace she is voluntarily and cheerfully subject, alone rules. She will therefore submit her neck to no yoke of human bondage, whatever form or whatever name usurpers of authority may give such yoke. She wants no pope to lord it over her, but she just as little wants pastors or councils to legislate for her and bring her into subjection. She will not surrender the liberty wherewith Christ has made her free. In short, she wants the Lord alone to reign and His Word alone to decide and to guide in matters of faith and conscience, and therefore holds it a matter of not merely personal preference, but of eternal moment, to assert her liberty. If another than God is permitted to usurp supreme authority and to reign over our souls, we not only become slaves under their domination, but place our salvation and that of our fellowmen in jeopardy. For God can save us, and man cannot. If we hear God's Word and let Him reign over us, we are safe in time and in eternity; if we fall into the hands of men, our welfare here and hereafter is insecure. Therefore let us hold fast the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, though it should cost us something to assert it and maintain it. It is worth more than all the opposition and machination of men can make it cost us in obloquy and conflict, for it involves not only important interests in human life in this world, and that not only for ourselves, but for generations yet to come, but it concerns the eternal welfare of millions for whom Christ died.

MISSIONARY THOUGHTS IN THE GOSPEL LESSONS OF THE CHURCH YEAR.

BY REV. J. SHEATSLEY, S. T. B., DELAWARE, OHIO.

There is no question but that the discussion of the above subject will be of practical help to us pastors. We find on the one hand that the Church is full of missionary talk and missionary attempts, but on the other, that missionary fervor and hence missionary activity are by no means what we would like to see. The earnest pastor is therefore always ready to utilize any suggestion which may enable him to add fuel to the missionary flame. For one thing he knows that in order to build up a missionating church, it will not do to feed his people by fits and spells, in a haphazard way, and indirectly as with a side-dish, but that they must have stated and abundant supplies of genuine missionary food. It is a law in the animate kingdom of nature and it is likewise a law in the still more animate kingdom of God, the realm of spiritual and true life, that development takes place by growth. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" illustrates the process of growth both in the kingdom of nature and in the kingdom of God. But where growth is expected, there the requisite plant food must be present. A missionary spirit, which alone makes missionary activity possible, must be rooted in missionary soil and supplied with missionary food. And although it is true that every Christian, just because he is a Christian, is rooted in missionary soil, for the Christian religion is by its very nature a missionary religion, yet the individual believer must be made conscious of this fact, else, so far as real missionary work is concerned, he may stand there as barren as a sterile stalk of corn in the richest loam. He must be fertilized; he must be made to understand that he has received salvation not simply for his own sake, but also for the sake of others; he must be helped to reach out the tendrils of his assimilative powers, so that he may lay hold on the missionary thoughts of Christ's teaching and both find light to know what His Master's will is and also strength to do that will with joyfulness.

This is all clear and needs only to be stated in order to be accepted. But how shall we go about it to supply our people with missionary food to a sufficient extent and in a regular manner? This question is not so easily answered, at least the writer has never been able to answer it satisfactorily to himself. I believe also that, although it may not have been so stated, the present discussion was called for with the view of finding, at least, a partial answer to this question. In studying the subject I was put to thinking, as never before, on the contents of the regular gospel lessons for the Church year with special reference to missions. The idea of the Church year is to set forth in their natural order, in one year, all the essential facts and teachings of the life and gospel of Christ. Now the subject of missions is one of the essential teachings of the gospel. It may not be strictly essential to the believer's personal salvation, at least, it is not necessary to discuss that point here, but the subject is certainly essential to the development of God's kingdom. The question now arose, does our idea of the Church year, with the system of pericopes in use among us, supply, in due proportion and properly distributed, the material for the development of missionary thought and activity? If the Lutheran Church has the correct idea of the Church year and a correct system of pericopes, the answer can only be, "Yes." For everything that is necessary for missionary knowledge, love and work is contained in the life and teaching of Christ. These are the gospel, and the gospel is the only producer of genuine missionary activity. If then the Church year gives us not only the fundamental facts of the gospel, such as the incarnation, the passion, the resurrection and the ascension of Christ, the mission of the Holy Ghost, and the final judgment, but also facts of less importance, as the circumcision of Christ, the Epiphany and others, and the long list of lessons for the Sundays after Trinity, we evidently have just what we need. We are sure then that our idea of the Church year is all right also from a missionary point of view. It is another question, however, whether, from this point of view, the system of pericopes in use in our midst is the best possible collection. For it is possible to have a correct idea of the Church year and yet to have a very

poor selection of pericopes, a system, viz., which does not bring out in due proportion and in proper order all the great facts of the gospel necessary to develop a well-rounded Christian life. If the Church year were being constructed in the present missionary age, more direct missionary material might find its way into the lessons, to the prejudice, however, perhaps, of other essential doctrines. On examination then it will be found that, for missionary purposes, a better system of pericopes than the one we now have could in general not have been made without possibly weakening some other essential features of Christian doctrine and life. This, we think, will be made to appear within the limits of this discussion.

The more important question now is, How shall we pastors and preachers use this Church year with its system of lessons in order to realize the greatest possible good for the development of missionary thought and life? How shall we get hold of the missionary material that is certainly contained in the Church year, and work it up as food for our people? On its fixed lessons and, whenever we may feel an impulse to give our people some missionary food, go elsewhere for our texts and matter? There are no doubt occasions when one is justified in doing this, when it is even necessary to do so, as in the case of mission festivals upon week or non-festival days for which the Church has prescribed no lessons. But these instances do not come under discussion here at all, at least not directly, since I have been asked to present the missionary thought in the regular Gospels of the Church year; and the object is to show that there is possibly a way of supplying our people with missionary food and fuel from the Church year itself, so that they will not be dependent upon one or two mission festivals during the year, nor upon the whims or uncertain missionary impulses of the pastor, but that they will receive the missionary supply just as regularly and systematically as they do the lessons of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter and the like. The object of this discussion then is not only to show that the Church year contains missionary matter, but also to present a practical plan for giving our people the benefit of this matter.

One method of treatment would be this: Take the Gospel lessons in their order of succession and in each one, as regularly as the Sunday comes, find a missionary thought and give it to the people. By this method the people would get a portion of missionary food every Sunday and festival, from the beginning of the Church year to the end of the same. Whatever may be said in favor of this method, there are some things to be said against it and on account of which it does not commend itself as the wisest course. It may be perfectly in place in a weekly periodical where one aims to give only the missionary thought of the lesson, but it is not practical in the pulpit where one is expected to develop the main thought of the text. Besides, this method does not commend itself on the principle that to give the people a pinch of medicine frequently will not prove to be so effective as to give them a liberal dose less frequently; and no man can in thirty or forty minutes do justice to the Gospel lessons respectively by bringing out their chief thought and preach a direct sermon on missions yet besides. This latter, unless the Gospel lesson contains a direct missionary thought, must of necessity consist of a few general statements and applications, which generally do not make much of an impression. This method would accordingly result in a kind of playing at missions throughout the year and it might; instead of rousing our people to missionary activity, actually put them to sleep. The preacher should not roam over the whole field of theology and Christian life every Sunday. Let him rather pick out for each Sunday one sharp long nail and drive that in to the head. The people will then get something which they will feel and in consequence also remember. But there is another reason why this method would not be wise and why it again might be positively hurtful. It is a mistake to think that every Gospel lesson contains a direct missionary thought, or that from every theme missionary thoughts can be deduced, whose connection with the theme will be so plain that the people can readily see it. It is of course possible to attach missionary thoughts to every Gospel lesson and to every gospel thought, from the fact that the gospel truth is a system and hence a unit. You can take any gospel thought and by logical deduction reach any

other gospel thought, or even any thought of the law. The preacher can therefore take any Gospel lesson and introduce missionary thoughts, but it would be a mistake to think that this would always be edifying to the people. Each text has its legitimate scope and it is illegitimate to go beyond that. The effect furthermore upon the hearers of finding the subject of missions in each lesson, whether it is directly contained in it or not, might not only be unedifying, but the more intelligent might begin to question, whether the preacher really understands his business, or whether missions, if they must be substantiated by such indirect means and farfetched deductions, are really necessary and obligatory upon the believer. The plan then of finding a missionary thought in every Gospel lesson of the Church year is not to be recommended, and if that was the purpose of the committee who suggested our subject, then this discussion will not meet expectations.

Another method and the one which we will advocate is this: For a direct missionary purpose use only those Gospel lessons which plainly contain a missionary thought, and the more prominent this thought the better, as for example the lesson for Epiphany, the one concerning the centurion, or the Syrophenician woman. This method will furnish the preacher with two requisites: first, it will supply him with a good proportion of missionary matter throughout the year; secondly, it will in every case by offering a suitable text, prescribed by the Church herself, furnish him with good reasons for preaching on missionary subjects at stated times. In this way he would not, on the one hand, be left at the mercy of uncertain missionary impulses which he might or might not feel during the year, but would have prescribed lessons at suitable intervals, which he would be expected to treat from a missionary standpoint; on the other hand, he would not be bound to look for some missionary thought in each lesson, but would be free to develop each lesson according to one of its leading thoughts. He would furthermore not be necessitated to break in upon the continuity of thought in the Gospel lessons, as is done when one sets apart a certain Sunday of each month as missionary Sunday, and in case the Gospel lesson for the day does not offer suitable material goes

elsewhere for a text. I tried several times to follow this monthly missionary Sunday plan, but always felt that it broke in too frequently upon the regular lessons and hence discarded it. Monthly missionary services can be held, but it is hardly proper to give them the place of the chief service of the day. They may be held in the evening or upon a week day when this is possible, and may result in much good.

If then the plan here indicated is followed, the preacher will not only find the matter, the texts, prescribed, but the times also will be designated when this matter is to be presented. All that he will have to do is, first, to make a proper selection of texts from among the Gospel lessons of the year for missionary treatment, and secondly, to give these lessons such a thorough missionary treatment that the people will get just what they need.

But there is another thought in connection with this plan that needs to be emphasized before we proceed to consider the matter of the Gospel lessons in detail. So far we have spoken of the Gospel lessons simply as a collection of texts without taking into consideration their continuity of thought, or the fact, and this is especially true of the festal part of the Church year, that they give us the fundamental facts of our redemption in their historical order and so enable the Church each year to live over again the life of Christ. The life of Christ contains the whole gospel and since missionary matter is found only in the gospel, there must be points in the life of Christ at which this missionary matter comes to the surface. The thing now is to grasp these salient missionary points in the life and teaching of Christ and make them stand out prominently, yet in organic connection with the Church year, so that our people will see that missions belong just as truly to the gospel and are based just as really upon the life of Christ, as are the doctrines of baptism, of justification by faith, of personal holiness and all the others. This will have a tendency to incorporate missions as an integral part of our religion into our Christian confession and life. Missionary food would come to us naturally and systematically like other spiritual food, and we would be made to feel that missionary work of necessity belongs to our religion. For

I verily believe that many of our people think that missions are purely personal matters for the Christian in which he may engage, if he chooses to do so, but is under no obligation to do so from any necessity of his religion, and it may be well to ask whether our loose and disconnected way of presenting the subject has not much to do with this feeling? By conducting our missionary services to a very large extent as extra services, by which I mean that we hold them upon a different hour or day than the hour for the regular Sunday service, also that a special text is taken, i. e. one that lies outside of the regular Gospel lessons, and that often still other distinguishing features from the regular service are added, such as that the service is held in a grove, speakers from abroad are secured, a brass band is enlisted, extra collections are held, and the like — by these methods, it seems to me, we have been trying to make ourselves believe, unconsciously of course, and in a measure have actually made our people believe, that missions are a kind of appendix to one's religion. These extra services as Children's Day, mission festivals, speakers from abroad, extra collections and the like are all right, provided they are not made to constitute the whole of missionary food for the year, but are really looked upon as something added or extra, not, as added to one's religion, but to the regular missionary ministrations, both liturgical and homiletical, based upon the Church year. Let the Church year by its regular lessons and ministrations supply the people with a due proportion of missionary food, not in mere crumbs of general statements and exhortations loosely attached to some other leading discussion, but in generous pieces of meat taken bodily from the Gospel lessons and from the fundamental thoughts of the Church year, then, if possible, let these extra services be added as extra missionary dishes to show our people the great importance of missions as a part of our religion. The point to be made then is this: Let us arrange our missionary ministration in such a way as not to make the impression that missions do not belong to the fundamental idea of the gospel and to the regular work of the Church, but on the contrary let us incorporate the subject within the Church

year where it belongs and with the very idea of our religion.

I wish to add yet that the above thought, the relation of the Church year to missions, in the writer's humble opinion, deserves more consideration at our hands than it evidently has been receiving. I do not remember of ever hearing the thought developed in any of our missionary discussions, nor for that matter even so much as stated. Nor did I in preparing this paper find in the books at my command, nor in the lists of other books, anything that seemed to bear directly upon this subject. Perhaps our district may yet lay claim to having discovered a new thought. But all humor aside, it seems to me that the realization of this thought in faithful practice in our churches would give us a better basis for missionary work than we have at present.

We will now proceed to the discussion of the subject really before us, viz., the missionary thoughts contained in the Gospel lessons of the Church year. It will be seen from what has already been said that we will not take up the Gospel lessons successively, simply as a collection of texts, but we will take up the Church year and the Gospel lessons, mostly in groups, as giving expression to the underlying thought of the Church year. The Church year, as is very well known, falls naturally into two parts; first, the festal part, beginning with the first Sunday in Advent and extending to Trinity Sunday; secondly, the non-festal part, embracing the long list of Sundays after Trinity. In the festal part of the year we have three cycles of festivals, 1) the Christmas cycle, 2) the Easter cycle, 3) the Pentecostal cycle. These three seasons may be characterized in various ways; they are perhaps best distinguished from one another on the basis of the holy Trinity and in accordance with the threefold division of the Apostles' Creed. According to this definition the Christmas season would be chiefly the manifestation of God's love in sending His Son to save the world; the Easter season would comprise the actual working out of our salvation through Christ; while the Pentecostal season would tell us of the giving of the Holy Ghost as the applier of salvation. In these three cycles, then, are contained all the facts of our redemption;

and since this is so, there must be found here all that is necessary for the upbuilding of the Church, and hence also missionary food. But it must be remembered, on the other hand, that the Church year was not constructed for the special purpose of teaching missions any more than to teach any one other distinctive doctrine. Its aim is to give the great historical and fundamental facts of redemption and not special doctrines or special activities of the Church. Although therefore there is in these great cycles of festivals abundant material for the subject of missions, yet we will find some difficulty in getting just what we want for a distinctive presentation of missionary thought and work, and we will have still greater difficulty in finding the suitable place and time for such presentation.

We begin with the Christmas cycle. This is introduced by the four Sundays in Advent. The idea of the Advent season is that of preparation for the Christmas festival; we are to prepare our hearts for the coming of Christ just as John the Baptist was sent before to prepare the way of the Lord. Of this idea of the Advent season it must be said that it contains no direct missionary thought, yet there is a broad basis here upon which we can stand to preach a good missionary sermon, viz., that the coming of Christ is meant for the whole world and the whole world should therefore be prepared for Him, and furthermore, that the Church should make this known among the heathen just as John made it known among the Jews. The lesson for the third Sunday in Advent will furnish suitable material for this purpose. It is the pericope in which the Baptist sends some of his disciples to ask Christ whether He is the Messiah or not. Jesus gave John this answer: "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me." These words can easily be made to apply to the unevangelized, for spiritually they are blind and lame and leprous and deaf and dead and poor. If one did not care to use the whole lesson for the subject of missions, he could devote at least one division of the sermon to that subject, and I believe that it would generally be of more practical

benefit to the people than devoting considerable time, as is often done, to the uncertain discussion why John ever asked Jesus this question. Thus in the very beginning of the Church year our people would be made to feel that the heathen have a portion in the gospel and that it is the Church's duty to see that they get what belongs to them.

As to the Christmas festival itself, here the coming of Christ into the world is of such overreaching importance that it is difficult to say much more than simply this: Jesus Christ, the Savior, is born. There is plenty of missionary material here, for did not the angel say to the shepherds, "I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people"? And did not the angels sing, "On earth peace, good will toward men"? There is no limitation of the good tidings and of the peace and good will to this or to that nation, but they are meant for the whole world. Yet just because the Church is celebrating Christ's coming into the world, it seems a little forced to make special reference to the heathen upon this day. Would it not be possible, however, to do something directly for missions in a second service on Christmas, where this is possible, or on the day after Christmas, which the Church also carries as a festival? If after the proper celebration of Christmas, in which the blessings of Christ's advent into the world were pointed out, there could be another service, wholly or at least in part devoted to missions, showing how these good tidings at which we rejoice are meant also for the heathen, this seems to me, would be calculated to make a vivid impression of the need and value of missionary work. Also in the children's service for Christmas, in which the Epiphany lesson, one of the missionary lessons of the Church year, is generally found, more direct missionary matter might be introduced.

We pass over the lesson for New Year, which is devoted to the circumcision of Jesus, and go on to the Epiphany lesson. Epiphany, as was stated above, is one of the missionary festivals of the Church year. The lesson is the account of the visit of the wise men from the East. The Church has always looked upon these men as the first fruits of the Gentile world. It is a revelation of the fact that, not only will Christ receive the Gentiles, but also that the Gentiles will receive Christ, and thus it affords suitable material

for missionary teaching. Unfortunately, however, the festival does not fall upon Sunday, except once in six or seven years, and it furthermore does not seem to be considered of sufficient importance to celebrate it for its own sake as is the case with Christmas. The result is that this most suitable festival is but little used by our Church in the service of missions. Could we not inaugurate a change here and make this day the missionary festival of the year? Even if we could not get all of our congregations out, nor even the greater portion of them, would it still not be well to begin to make this a missionary day? It might be suggested to use the Epiphany lesson on the first Sunday after New Year, provided this precedes Epiphany, instead of the pericope on the flight of Jesus into Egypt and the murder of the innocents at Bethlehem. This, however, would be breaking in upon the regular lessons of the Church year, a thing against which we already, in a measure, advised.

Epiphany is followed by the six Sundays after Epiphany. We will speak of but one of these, one, however, which is admirably adapted for a missionary sermon. It is the lesson for the third Sunday after Epiphany, the second part of which speaks of the healing of the centurion's servant. Two facts in this lesson mark it as missionary matter, 1) that the centurion was a Gentile, yet Jesus heard his prayer and helped him; 2) the statement of Jesus, "Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out." I may well ask here, where can we get better material for our purpose, and yet how seldom we give this lesson a thorough missionary treatment. Usually we think we have done enough when we have loosely attached a few missionary thoughts or made a few general applications.

We pass on to the next great festival cycle, that of Easter. This begins with Septuagesima, being the ninth Sunday before Easter. These Sundays preceding Easter, especially the six Sundays in Lent, constitute a time of preparation for Good Friday and Easter, or the death and resurrection of Christ. In this respect they correspond to the Advent Sundays with reference to the Christmas festival. Among the

lessons for these Sundays we again find one that is very well adapted for a missionary service. It is the lesson for the second Sunday in Lent and records Christ's experience with the Syrophenician woman. The fact that this woman was a Gentile, that Jesus at first did not heed her request because He was sent alone to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but upon her persistent prayer did afterwards grant all her desire, and the fact that He admired her great faith, this is all matter of a missionary nature and affords ample material for an entire, or if one prefers, for half a sermon. We thus find provided, also in this season of the Church year, a good lesson on missions.

During holy week itself the passion of Christ is, of course, the all-predominating thought, and if services are held only upon Good Friday it is a little difficult to say much in a direct way about missions. But in city congregations, or in country charges where the pastor has but one or two congregations, and where services are held also upon other days than Good Friday, possibly upon every day of the week, there seems to be no reason why at least one of these services, either in whole or in part, might not be devoted to the subject of missions. There is plenty of material here. The thought that Christ suffered and died for the world is already enough and plenty of texts can be found containing that thought. Then there are other facts in the passion history that can be used, such as the request of certain Greeks to see Jesus (John 12, 20-23), or the cry of the centurion, "Truly, this was the Son of God."

We pass on to the Easter festival itself. Here the overpowering theme is the resurrection of Christ, and one feels that it would be out of place to preach a distinctive sermon, or even a part of one, on missions. Yet, in order to keep the fact continually before our people that missions have their ground in the fundamental facts of our redemption, it is well if we can in some way bring missions also into direct connection with the resurrection of Christ. If we cannot do this very well on the Easter festival itself, we can do so very nicely on the second Sunday after Easter. Here we have the Gospel lesson on Christ as the good Shepherd, when He says among other things, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall

hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." What an excellent thought for missions, and how easily it is brought into connection with the Easter festival and the resurrection of Christ. The Savior arose a few weeks ago, and now He lives that He may be the Shepherd of all His sheep, and these sheep are still scattered about in all the world, but they must be brought together into one fold.

The Pentecostal cycle next claims our attention. The season of preparation for Pentecost may be said to begin with the fourth Sunday after Easter. There are here three Sundays, the pericopes of which speak of Christ's going to the Father and of the sending of the Comforter. None of these contain direct missionary thoughts, nor do we particularly need such here, for it will not do to have too many missionary Sundays in the year. Yet in the midst of this period falls Ascension day, which is the second great missionary festival of the year, Epiphany being the first. It is such, not so much perhaps on account of the event that is celebrated, as on account of the actual contents of the lesson. In the Gospel lesson for this day, taken from Mark 16, we have the great commission upon which the work of missions is based, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." How easy to show our people here that our ascended Lord wants us to carry His Gospel to the ends of the earth, and that missions are made necessary by the very nature of the Church's work. But unfortunately this festival never falls upon a Sunday, and by a great portion of the Church the event is not considered of sufficient importance to celebrate the day. The great lesson of the day is therefore lost. Here I would again ask, as I did concerning Epiphany, Could we not make more of the festival of Ascension and by special services show our people in a lively and impressive manner that the last command of our ascending Lord was to preach the Gospel to every creature? Most of us have missionary festivals during the year, why could we not, instead of allowing some season of the natural year or some other natural convenience determine the day for us—why could we not be governed by the Church year and select our day in harmony with this and so choose Ascension day or Epiphany, or perhaps both? If it is said that our people are not sufficiently interested in these things,

would this not be a means of getting them interested, both in the days themselves and in the cause of missions?

We now come to Pentecost itself. Here again, like at Easter and Christmas, we have such a commanding theme, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, that we cannot very well depart from it, even for the sake of speaking of missions. There is, however, plenty of suitable material here also. The Gospel lesson taken by itself cannot be used so readily for this purpose, but by reference to the epistle where it is shown that the first believers were endowed by the Holy Ghost to speak all manner of tongues and were thus prepared to carry the Gospel to all nations, it can readily be shown that the Comforter of whom the Gospel lesson speaks was given not only to lead the disciples themselves into the truth, but also to fit them to bring this truth to others. Yet unless two services are held on this day, or unless Whitmonday is used, one cannot hope to do much more for missions than to devote some subdivision of the sermon to that subject. It would not be wise to allow missions to crowd out the great theme of the day.

The next festival, which is, however, not a festival in the proper sense of that term, is Trinity Sunday. It closes the festival part of the year and forms a kind of transition to the non-festal part. The idea of the day is a kind of summing up of the meaning of the three great festival seasons into the action of the Holy Trinity, as this is made apparent in the new birth. There is material here also for missions, for unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. But if they are to be born again thus, the Gospel with baptism must be offered them. Yet one feels that it would be rather forced and unnatural to speak directly of missions on Trinity Sunday.

Let us now sum up what we have on missions in the festal part of the Church year. First, we have found four Gospel lessons, upon as many Sundays, one in the season of Advent, one after Epiphany, one in Lent and one after Easter, thus properly distributed among the great festivals, and which are admirably suited for missionary discussions. Secondly, we have found that two of the festivals are really the missionary festivals of the Church year, Epiphany and Ascension day. And thirdly, we have found that in con-

nection with the other festivals there is abundant material that might be utilized, if not in connection with the chief service of the day, yet perhaps in a secondary service or upon another day.

We pass on now to the non-festal part of the Church year. These Sundays are all called Sundays after Trinity and the highest number possible in any one year are twenty-seven. The Church's object is, in this part of the year, to apply the facts of redemption, which were revealed during the festal part of the year. It is therefore expected that all the doctrines of God's Word and all the activities of the Church will find recognition during these Sundays, and hence also the subject of missions will be duly considered. We will proceed to note briefly those lessons that seem well suited for missionary discussion. The first is the lesson for the second Sunday after Trinity, being the parable of the great supper. After those who had been invited refused to come, the master told the servant to "go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind." Many who have been invited again and again refuse to come, let us now carry the invitation to the unevangelized and to the heathen; this the missionary thought. Or since we have another lesson similar to this, the marriage of the king's son, and one which points more directly to the heathen than this, the lesson for the third Sunday after Trinity might be used, where it is said of Jesus that He seeks sinners and which contains the parable of the shepherd seeking the lost sheep and of the woman seeking the lost piece of silver. This would show how diligently we should go in search of those who are lost. Another suitable lesson is the one for the seventh Sunday after Trinity. It is the account of the feeding of the four thousand. The application to feeding with spiritual food and to the work of missions is easily made, especially, since Jesus says of many of the people that they were from afar and were in danger of fainting by the way. The fourteenth Sunday also supplies us with a suitable lesson. It records the cleansing of the ten lepers, only one of whom, a Samaritan, and therefore practically a Gentile, returned to give God thanks for the blessing received. This is a good example for showing that our work among the unevangelized will

not be in vain. Another good lesson is supplied by the twentieth Sunday after Trinity. Here we have the parable of the marriage of the king's Son. It is shown here how the Gospel was taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, for says the king, after he had "destroyed these murderers and burned up their cities," "Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage." This Gospel lesson does not only in general show that salvation is intended for the heathen also, but it shows in particular that all classes, both good and bad, are to be brought into the kingdom. The last lesson is the one for the twenty-sixth Sunday after Trinity, and pictures to us the scene of the judgment at the last day. The missionary thought is this, that all nations shall be gathered before Christ to be judged of Him and that they shall all be judged by what they have done or not done with reference to Him. We can only hope that the heathen will receive a favorable judgment when we have led them to Christ so that they may have been able to minister unto Him.

There are still other Gospel lessons that could be used for missionary purposes, but the above are among the most suitable, and what is especially worthy of note, they are distributed through the Trinity Sundays at proper intervals. Others, however, can be chosen according to one's liking during different years.

I have thus, as was my intention from the beginning, chosen only such Gospel lessons for missionary treatment that can be readily so used, either for the entire sermon, or at least for one of its main divisions. Summing all up we have now at least nine such Sundays, and these, furthermore, are pretty equally distributed throughout the Church year; four fall within the festal part and five fall within the non-festal part of the year. This already will supply the minister with a large amount of missionary matter, and, what is not the least important feature, will do this in a systematic manner and in organic connection with the Church year. We have also the great festivals of the Church year in connection with which there is abundant missionary material, if one can only find time and place to offer it. We have finally the two great missionary festivals of the year, Epiphany

and Ascension day, of which the Church ought to make a better use in the service of missions.

In conclusion allow me to say that a system of missionary teaching, something like the one outlined here, energetically carried out year after year, would, in my humble opinion, in the course of a few years, do much toward removing the present lack of knowledge and enthusiasm in the great cause of missions.

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

BY REV. E. H. D. WINTERHOFF, A. M., ANNA, OHIO.

Atonement, in its biblical sense, is the vicarious expiation of our guilt, and the rendering of complete satisfaction to the demands of God's holiness and justice upon sinful man by our great Redeemer, and the consequent propitiation of God to man and their mutual and reciprocal reconciliation.

Before entering upon a further consideration of the subject before us, and for gaining a fuller and more comprehensive knowledge of the same, it will be well to give

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE DOGMA.

The Bible is remarkably full and explicit in presenting to its readers the doctrine of atonement. It is doubtful whether there is any other article of our Christian faith so richly revealed in both the Old and the New Testament as the vicarious suffering of the Lamb of God. Whether we peruse the pages of the Old Testament, or we search the writings of the New Testament, this doctrine stands forth in bold relief. Sin had scarcely entered the world, when we also read of sacrifices brought unto the Lord. All the sacrifices of God's people, starting with the offering of Abel, Gen. 4, and culminating in the sin offering on the Day of Atonement, Lev. 16, point, in a more or less direct manner, to the vicarious sacrifice offered up once for all on Calvary's mountain. The Old Testament, however,

does not deal only in types of the one true atonement, but also, and especially Isaiah 53, tells us in plain words and awe-inspiring vividness, how the propitiation of our sins is accomplished.

Likewise the New Testament abounds in passages revealing unto us our redemption in Jesus' blood, and calling upon us to become reconciled unto God. Whether we hear the wonderful words of John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world," John 1, 29, and the statement of Jesus concerning Himself, "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give His life a ransom for many," Matt. 20, 29; or whether we ponder the profound epistles of St. Paul and the expositions of the Author of Hebrews, the burden of their gospel is the great doctrine of Atonement.

This being unquestionably so, it may, indeed, surprise us, that this important and glorious doctrine was apparently neglected by the Church for a thousand years. For though it must be admitted, as Dr. Philippi demonstrates, *Glaubenslehre* Vol. IV, Part II, p. m. 51ff., that in the writings of such noted Church Fathers as Irenæus, Origen, Athanasius, Augustine and others the essential elements of the orthodox doctrine of atonement may be found, it is nevertheless true, and becomes all the more apparent by such admission, that none of them, nor any other one of the Fathers, entered into a thorough and consistent discussion of this important subject. They have not left unto the Church a correct definition, a fixed and consistent development of the biblical doctrine of atonement. It belongs to those doctrines which were not defined in the Œcumenical Councils, and concerning which great vagueness prevailed. Even a man like Gregory of Nazianzen speaks of this subject as of a theme concerning which the human mind may profitably philosophize without danger of going astray. (Conf. Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 161).

It is therefore not surprising that Dr. H. Schmidt in Herzog's *Ency.*, vol. 16, p. 378, expresses his well-grounded astonishment that during a thousand years from the times of St. Paul to the days of the great Archbishop of Canterbury, the importance of this doctrine should not have been

realized, nor a clear and comprehensive understanding of the same manifested. How was it possible, he asks, that a question, which so concerns the very heart and life of Christian truth, found such little attention? How could the Church for centuries celebrate the passion of Christ with great solemnity and devotion without attempting to arrive at a clear comprehension of the importance and necessity of His suffering and death? How could it read the epistles of St. Paul, and apparently pass by the very problem which lies at the foundation of his theology?

There are reasons to explain this remarkable historic fact. The interrogator himself points out, and no doubt correctly, as the main reason for this state of affairs, that to the Fathers there was wanting a clear conception and full consciousness of the guilt of sin. By their heathen surroundings, as well as by the errors arising within the Church, the attention of these Fathers was more especially directed to the evil power of sin. With the Greek Fathers it was more particularly that evil power which darkens the intellect. Accordingly they considered the enlightenment of the mind by the divine Logos and the restoration of the knowledge of God obscured by sin as the essential need of the soul and its redemption. With the Latin Fathers, hence also with Augustine, sin was preëminently that evil power which perverts the will, and fills the heart with evil concupiscence. Hence with them redemption consisted, above all, in the implanting in man of that power of grace, which would overcome and destroy the power of sin. The fountain of this all-conquering grace is Christ the Redeemer.

We certainly value the importance of these divine truths, and know what yeoman service they rendered to the Church in the Pelagian controversy. Sin certainly is an evil power which darkens the intellect as well as it perverts the will, but it is more. Sin also is an offence, a debt, — guilt. And because the mind of the Church seems to have been diverted from this view of sin, which is necessary to a true development of the doctrine of atonement, we may find therein an explanation why such a development was not even attempted. There seems to have been also

no special occasion for dwelling on this doctrine as it became no topic of controversy.

Another factor also enters into consideration which diverted the mind of the Church from a true development of this doctrine. It is the theory of a ransom paid to Satan. By sin man has sold himself to Satan. Satan has become his lawful master. Hence man's redemption consists in this that Christ purchased him with a price from Satan. To this end Jesus gave His own life as a ransom — a ransom to Satan. This transaction was illustrated in many different and even grotesque ways. The truthful and the erroneous, the sublime and the ridiculous, the solemn and the ludicrous became wonderfully mixed up. In fact this theory furnishes us the "stupid devil" (dummen Teufel). For Satan was utterly tricked and cheated out of his possession. In the appearance of man Jesus offered Himself to Satan as a ransom for mankind. Satan accepted the offer, and seized upon Jesus, either considering Him merely a man, or expecting with the man Jesus also to get the Divinity into his possession and under his control. When thus Jesus had given Himself as a ransom to Satan, and the latter being well satisfied with his bargain, and therefore relinquished his hold and right on the human race, then the Divinity also asserted itself in Christ. To his consternation Satan learned, that he could not hold his price. His ransom slipped away from him. Satan is duped, and tricked out of his possession.

Thus Origen compares the cross of Christ unto a net in which the devil is caught. Gregory of Nyssa calls the humanity of Jesus the bait, and His divinity the hook; swallowing the bait, Satan is caught in the hook. Augustine, and, following him, Peter Lombard, called the cross of Christ, as also His mortal body, a mouse-trap into which Satan was enticed to his own confusion and ruin. Innocent and sober traces of this view are also found in later and Lutheran theology. Luther himself sings:

Quite secretly He kept His might,
In my poor flesh he walked to sight,
That He might catch the devil.

(Gar heimlich führt' er sein Gewalt;
Er ging in meiner armen G'stalt,
Den Teufel wollt' er fangen.)

Thus centuries passed away, and no advancement in a genuine development of the doctrine of atonement can be recorded.

The man to whom above all is due the honor of having inaugurated the first scientific development of the doctrine of atonement and of having given a new impetus to its thorough ventilation is Anselm, (1033-1109) father of orthodox Scholasticism and Archbishop of Canterbury. The influence of his epoch making work "Cur Deus Homo" is felt in orthodox theology to this day.

Anselm taught that sin is a debt, and that because of the justice of God and the perfection of the divine nature this debt must be paid, i. e., the penalty incurred by the guilt of sin must be suffered. The sinner must endure the penalty of his transgression in his own person, unless a substitute can be found who is in all respects fully qualified for his office. This was realized in the God-man Jesus and in Him alone. (Schaff.-Herzog, vol. I, p. 165). Nevertheless, it was neither the active obedience of Christ, nor His passive obedience as such, that merited salvation, but rather the free and supererogatory gift of His life. The holy and innocent Jesus in freely giving His life as a ransom to God, merited a reward of God. Jesus, however, can receive no rewards, for all things that are the Father's are already His. Hence He bestows His merited reward on those for whose salvation He became man. (Fisher, pp. 220 and 221).

By emphasizing the guilt of man's sin on the one hand, and the justice and holiness of God on the other hand, Anselm directed the inquiring mind into the proper channel for a correct solution and development of the doctrine of Atonement. Luther and other Reformers, as well as leading theologians in the Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, adopted and, in their own way, developed this Anselmic and Biblical doctrine, concerning which the Confessions of these denominations bear witness.

The most formidable enemy of this orthodox doctrine of atonement is Faustus Socinus (1539-1604), and Socinianism. With keen and fearless logic, ready to accept all its own conclusions and consequences, Socinianism battled against this doctrine, and resolutely rejected the necessity, the possibility, the reality, and the efficacy of a vicarious atonement by the God-man Christ Jesus.

To say God can not forgive sins without satisfaction being rendered Him, is limiting His omnipotence, and to assert that He will not pardon without shedding of blood is destruction of His mercy and love. Hence to speak of the necessity of a vicarious atonement for man's salvation is putting in chains the free agency of free and sovereign Deity.

The possibility of atonement is denied on the ground that atonement and pardon are contradictory terms. If the sinner, or his substitute, has atoned for his sins, there is no longer room for pardoning them. Again, it would not be really paying the debt if the creditor pays the debt of the debtor, and it would not be truly satisfying divine Justice, if God Himself in His Son should pay the debt which sinful man owes Him. It would also not be in keeping with God's holiness and justice to punish the innocent Jesus for the offences of the guilty human race. Virtue and sin, moreover, are inherent in the individuals and cannot be transferred from one to the other; hence also merited reward or deserved punishment are intransmissible.

Against the reality or verity of Christ's atonement it is asserted that man's wages of sin is death — absolute, eternal death; but that the death of Christ was only temporary, as evinced by His resurrection on the third day, and hence could not have been an adequate propitiation for man's guilt. If it be claimed that Christ is also true God, the retort comes forthwith that then less suffering of the infinite God would have been able to atone for the sins of finite man. Thus our doctrine of atonement is stigmatized as no real and adequate "satisfactio" at all, but either a "parumfactio" or a "nimisfactio."

Finally the efficacy and morality of such vicarious atonement is assailed. If Christ as our substitute fulfilled the law for us, then we are released from its observation as

well as from its penalty. Therefore, it is claimed, our doctrine of atonement gives license to lawlessness and in so far is immoral. On the other hand we are charged by Socinus and his sect, that we make faith supplementary to Christ's atonement, and thus admit its inefficacy and insufficiency for our salvation. If Christ's atonement is really and effectually a satisfaction to God for man's transgression, it would be so irrespective of man's belief or unbelief. The debt is simply paid, and that settles it.

It is apparent that Socinianism has no room for the doctrine of an objective and vicarious atonement. It, in fact, also knows of no propitiation of God to man, but only of a conciliation of man to God. Christ is our ensample and teacher merely; from His teaching, life and death we are to learn and receive inspiration to abandon sin, and thus become reconciled to God. (Philippi, Vol. IV, Part II, pp. 156-172; Fisher, p. 224).

Without now stopping to explain the errors and fallacies of Socinianism, let it, for the present, suffice, simply to remind the reader, that this sect also rejects the divinity of Christ and original sin.

Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) in opposing the Socinian theory of atonement advocated what is known as the governmental theory of atonement. God as sovereign ruler has the right to pardon and remit the penalties of His subjects according to His discretion without any other satisfaction than the dictates of His wisdom. Yet, to preserve order and prevent future transgressions, His, the Lawgiver's, hatred of sin must become manifest to His subjects, and the penalty which the transgression of His laws merits must be revealed unto them. This is realized in the suffering and death of God's own Son. Thus our Redeemer Christ is to us in reality only a warning "penal example."

The mystical theory of atonement advocated by Schleiermacher and his school is a wrong application of the true doctrine of "unio mystica." The Christ for us vanishes in the Christ in us. "The redemptive agency of Christ consists in the imparting to men, through the attractive power which He exerts upon them, that inward consciousness of fellowship with God which in Him is absolutely controlling, and holds every other feeling in due subordination to

itself. His atoning work is the communication to them of His own undisturbed blessedness, which is the concomitant of this filial communion with God. Christ receives the believer to be partaker of His holiness and blessedness — of His inward spiritual life." (Fisher, p. 505).

Ritschl also denies the penal or expiatory quality of the death of Christ. God is unchangeable, therefore no change in His relation to man can take place. He is love, and there is in His nature nothing that would demand satisfaction, nor a desire to impose penalty. Our atonement is nothing else but a change of our consciousness of God and of God's judgment concerning sin, a banishing of the consciousness of guilt by a full apprehension of God's infinite love.

EVANGELICAL PARAMENTICS.

BY REV. THEODORE SCHAEFER, D. D., DIRECTOR OF THE DEACONESS INSTITUTION AT ALTONA. TRANSLATED BY
REV. D. M. MARTENS, D. D., COLUMBUS, O.

In the matter of evangelical church architecture a lively interest, greater than ever before, has manifested itself of late. Even the hand of woman has taken an active and efficient part in decorating and ornamenting the house of God. Naturally her part consists chiefly in the preparation of drapery, or coverings, for altar, pulpit and baptismal font; and in this work regard must always be had to old churchly rules and usage, both as to color, material and pattern. The same may also be said of the embroidery and needlework on these draperies. These coverings are called paraments; the art of their preparation is called paramentics. It is an art practiced mostly by woman, and when carried on in the proper spirit is not only the expression of, but also an aid in promoting, a noble ideal. What an amount of diligence, love, taste and skill does the embroidery on many a parament bear witness of!

No one should antagonize work of this kind by saying: Women have more important matters to attend to. Cer-

tainly there are matters of greater, much greater importance, even for women, than the adorning of churches.—We note a lively realization of this in the ancient church already. For instance, when prisoners of war were to be ransomed, or famine-sufferers to be relieved, they did not hesitate to sell all the sacred vessels of silver and gold in order to secure the means for carrying out this benevolent purpose. But, do we all live, do we always live, in such times of distress, of crying need? May we not think of something else? Is not art cultivated in other departments? Why not then churchly art,—also by woman? Does not the divine gift of art imply the duty of its development and application? Is utility to be the ruling principle of life? True, that “wisdom” which antagonizes all beauty and everything ideal has its representatives too, one even who is a biblical character; it’s a pity though that his name is—Judas, the one who, when he found fault with Mary for wasting so much in that she poured the precious ointment over the Lord’s body, was reminded of his own sphere and told: “Let her alone; for she hath wrought a good work upon me.” Thus the Lord Himself justifies what she did; and His language is even now yet a wall of defense around all similar deeds. Over against Judas and all his ilk in the matter of utilitarianism we agree with Luther when he says: “I am not of the opinion that all arts should be set aside and count for nothing by reason of the Gospel, as some fanatical spirits claim, but would like to see all art, especially music, devoted to the service of Him who gave and created it.” Especially must we condemn the spirit and conduct of those who can have nothing elegant, artistic and fine enough in their own houses, but at once protest when anything is to be spent on the house of God. No, for the church the very best we can think of is just good enough. And those who are ready and willing to make some sacrifice for the church for its own sake, will also be ready always to take part in relieving the necessities of the brethren. We find the evidence of this in the history not only of the origin but also of the development of evangelical paramentics. A deaconess house was the birth-place of modern paramentics; in deaconess houses they are still most zealously cultivated and find their strongest churchly hold. The life and activity of the three men to whom we are in-

debted for the paramentics of the present time bear witness to this. These are Löhe, the intellectual originator; Meurer, the theoretical artist; Beck, the executive artist.

Rev. Wilhelm Löhe, a son of Franconia and of the Lutheran Church, was born April 21, 1808. His parents were honorable, substantial, pious citizens of his native town, Fürth. In the deep ardor of his piety he was always sincerely devoted to the people and the Church of his home, while at the same time he always had a warm heart and a cheery word for strangers. The development of his life was harmonious, and, if we may so express ourselves, in straight lines. Of the struggles between faith and unbelief and other such conflicts he knew nothing. Of the marked religious character of his life when still a mere child he himself says: "As often as the bell called to the celebration of the Sacrament, the Church of his native town saw the boy as a spectator among the communicants. Besides the aged inmate of a hospital the boy was the only one who, with fervent prayer and song joined in the service." Roth, the rector of the gymnasium at Nürnberg, a man of excellent character, had charge of the training of the young man. Whilst in the high school at Erlangen, the Reformed Pastor and Professor, Krafft, did more than any one else for Löhe, who was to become a pillar of the Lutheran Church. During the first years of his ministry in various congregations circumstances forced him to take a decided stand against red-tapeism and trivial rationalism, at that time the dominant powers. This conflict, however, especially during the time he was in Nürnberg, developed the extraordinary gifts of this young pastor in such a wonderful manner that Prof. Höfling, of Erlangen, declared: "I must say that I have never yet heard such a preacher," and, for the sake of the theological students, did all that lay in his power to have him called to Erlangen, the seat of the university. Löhe himself also wished for this or a similar field of activity. But there were always hindrances in the way; and so it came to pass that a chain of circumstances led him to the small village of Neuendettelsau, near Ansbach, at sight of which he exclaimed: "I do not want to be dead in the nest." There he staid during the rest of his life—he died January 2, 1872—and if Neuendettelsau is known the world over, this is due exclusively

to the active labors of its pastor, Wilhelm Löhe. We pass over those years of conflict into which he was drawn by the force of circumstances which, both in narrower and wider circles, still called for much improvement. Even though his zeal did sometimes manifest itself in a storm of impatience, yet we are constrained to say that he never sought to magnify himself, but that "the one desire of his heart was a longing for better conditions." When Harless was called as president of the chief consistory of Bavaria and a better state of affairs began to prevail he found relief and the way was opened for his labors in the department of inner missions, notably of the female diaconate. Here he found abundant opportunity for the display of his creative power, his originality and geniality. Here he developed into the noble Christian character, and exceptionally able pastor, being known as such in the height of his power; a very prince in the Church, in the humble garb of a village pastor. His talents were many-sided and harmonious to an unusual degree; he was a master in all the duties and activities of the spiritual office; it would have been hard to find his equal as preacher, liturgist, pastor or catechist. At the same time he rendered the Church valuable service with his pen. He is the author of about sixty larger and smaller volumes. In addition to his manifold labors as pastor and author he was the founder and manager of a whole colony of institutions. Von Zezschwitz says of him: "He was a priestly soul; whenever he officiated in the pulpit or at the altar, his breath streamed forth like a flame." His bodily appearance already was an index to the spirituality of his character. His large head, which never failed to attract the attention of strangers, his high forehead, his mouth so expressive of firmness, his powerful voice—all were uncommon. His large eye was of a light blue color and was now very mild, then again piercing. The whole expression of his face was peaceful, indicative, often, of a longing for the better world.

That product of his creative faculty which interests us most at this time is his deaconess institution, in which his originality is everywhere apparent, he himself having planned not only its inner arrangement and life, but also the buildings, as to size, number, etc. This institution is the soil out of which the new evangelical paramentics grew, and the fact

of their growth is due to Löhe's personality. In him religion and art had joined hands; his extraordinary sense for the beautiful left a noble impress on everything that he produced, so that even those at a distance were attracted and filled with admiration. We see this in his penmanship as well as in his language, in his architecture as well as in the whole manner of his life. But especially do we see it in the view that Löhe took of the religious significance and artistic beauty of the cultus. "I can think of nothing more noble, more beautiful," says he, "than the services in which I worship my Savior; there all the arts of men unite in adoration, their countenance is transfigured, there their form and voice are renewed, there they give God the glory. . . . The holy liturgy in Church is grander than all the poetry of the world." The connection between the culminating points of the cultus and our theme he formulates after this wise: "The Sacrament is the nourishing food, the whole matter of paramentics only the platter; the richer the sacramental life, the more justification do we find for paramentics." In the deaconess house, and the sisters, Löhe at last found the most willing and efficient helpers in the execution of his plans.

When Löhe, in 1858, founded the Society for Paramentics, there was in all ecclesiastical history no precedent to look to, nothing whatever to pattern after. Everything had first to be thought out, created, tested. As evidence of the fact that there was no disposition to sacrifice the useful to the beautiful we find, among other conditions of membership, this: "That no one is eligible to membership in the society who cannot spin, knit, darn stockings and do plain sewing. And the ideal of a deaconess devoting herself to paramentics is that of one who can sow the flax, harvest it, prepare, spin and weave it, bleach the linen, and then make it up into altar coverings." For very good reasons we can of course not approve of all this—"life is short and art is long"—and yet we cannot fail to recognize in this the zeal, the enthusiasm and sincere devotion of the master spirit in the whole undertaking. Löhe instructed the members in the theory of decorating sanctuaries, and gave them "ideas"—sometimes quite striking ones—on the designing and executing of patterns. He gave as much, at least as careful, consideration to small as to great things, and was always

ready with advice. The first real work done was the preparation of paraments for the Neuendettelsau parish church. The first order from a distance came from a Lutheran congregation in Baden. When the work was nearly finished the one who had sent in the order wrote, stating that he had made a mistake in giving the dimensions of the altar; so that the same mishap befell the filling of the very first order, that has befallen so many later ones—incredible as it may seem—showing how little people generally know about the metric system of measurement.

But what Löhe did in this department was really only a beginning, the gathering of a store-house of ideas. A real artist, a man of fine literary attainments, was needed, to arrange, systematize, utilize and impart to others these gathered ideas. This became the task of Moritz Meurer.

He was born in Pretzsch, a village between Wittenberg and Torgau, August 3, 1806. He attended school at Grimma and studied theology at Leipzig. How earnestly he devoted himself to his studies is attested by the fact that he was called upon to assist Prof. August Hahn (of Leipzig) in his celebrated disputation against rationalism. After spending some years as tutor he was called as pastor to Callenberg, Saxony, in 1841, where he remained up to the time of his death, May 10, 1877. Although his salary was very moderate he never "cast about" for another position, but labored on here patiently, "a conscientious, untiring pastor, an affectionate, humble, pure character, a faithful friend of the school, a preacher who could dive down very deep, and yet understood how to preach in a simple and truly refreshing way." By the products of his literary labors his influence was carried far beyond the bounds of his congregation. It was he who first edited the "*Pilger aus Sachsen*," which later became the official organ for church and school in Saxony. But of especial value are his historical writings, confined mostly to the time of the Reformation. His exhaustive life of Luther, which passed through three editions,* deserves especial mention. This work was made up so largely of the

* Was also translated into English, and published by Henry Ludwig & Co., of New York, in 1848. Rev. C. Spielmann, who at that time had a book depository in the old Seminary, South High St., sold quite a number of copies.—*Tr.*

words of Luther himself, and his cotemporaries, that it impressed one as being an autobiography of Luther. He also wrote brief sketches of the life of Luther, Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Hausmann and Myconius for a work entitled "The Fathers of the Lutheran Church." In the year 1855 the Theological Faculty at Leipzig made him a Licentiate of Theology.

From 1855 to 1859 his time and attention were devoted to the building of a church, the style of which bordered on the Romanesque, and affording the opportunity for the development and application of his theoretical and historical studies in the domain of paramentics. The opportunity had now come for the application of his artistic taste; but at the same time he was not blind to the difficulties that still met one in the attempt at carrying out the decorative part of church architecture. As a result of these studies and experiences, Meurer was the prime mover in the first exposition of ecclesiastical art, in Hohenstein, in 1863. This was not far from Callenberg, and it is to-day yet the center from which the field of church architecture receives light. So, for instance, Louis Scheele, of Leipzig, the acknowledged master in the art of manufacturing sacred vessels, dates the origin of his establishment from the time of the Hohenstein exposition.

Meurer's interest in ecclesiastical art was shared by his family and a circle of near and dear friends. His second wife and his grown daughter gave him active and skillful support by embroidering paraments. The circle of friends which Meurer gathered about him consisted of artists and lovers of art, the painter Andreæ, Superintendent Grossman, Louis Scheele, the sculptor F. Schneider, the architects Northhoff, Piper, Möckel and Mothes. The Countess Anna von Schulenburg also took a lively interest in this good work. A written (not printed) circular was sent out, and meetings held at various places where old works of ecclesiastical art are found. Through the exchange of ideas and experiences these meetings became the means of disseminating a higher ideal in this field of sacred art.

As to fundamental liturgical and paramentic principles, Meurer agreed throughout with Löhe. Both started from the same point. Personally he was not acquainted with Löhe; he never was in Neuendettelsau. His efforts were

directed first of all to impressing those fundamental principles, which he shared with Löhe, and which formed the basis of his as well as of Löhe's work in this particular department, on pastors and lay members as well. He aimed to do this by means of articles in periodicals, and more particularly by his small treatise on Altar Decorations—1868—and his larger work: "Church* Architecture from the Standpoint and According to the Usage of the Lutheran Church"—1877—a work which, on account of its practical adaptation to ends, its well-weighed advice based on rich experience, its fine taste, its liturgical correctness, its plain and well-chosen language, is to be heartily commended to all who are interested in building or remodeling a church.

And how much was done by the discussions carried on at these ecclesiastical art expositions in bringing about a more intimate knowledge of and a greater love for church decorations! Here often all depended on Meurer; he was the organizer, the worker, the main burden rested on his shoulders—in short he had to see to and direct everything; this is true of many expositions in Saxony, and also of the convocation at Stuttgart in 1869. He found motives and ideas for artistic decoration everywhere, in Scripture, in history and in the works of God in nature. Once he and Beck traveled together to an exposition at Stuttgart. When passing through a certain town, pointing to doves sitting on the margin of a fountain drinking and bathing, he said to his *compagnon de voyage*, "What a fine piece of embroidery that would be for the cover of a baptismal font." And how overjoyed he was when, not long after this, the artist laid before him the design skillfully wrought out!

Thus Löhe and Meurer laid the foundation for evangelical paramentics, only in theory it is true, receiving but little aid, and that only in a sporadic way, from artists, in their efforts to develop it. There was still lacking the man who would take hold of this department of art and make its systematization and development his life-work. We have several times already given the name of Beck. But we must add yet a sketch of the life and labors of this artist.

*Der Kirchenbau vom Standpunkt und nach dem Brauch der Lutherischen Kirche. 1877.

Martin Eugene Beck, the master of paramentics, as well of the artistic conception as of the practical execution of the same, was born in the Moravian congregation at Herrnhut, November 24, 1833. As a child he was sickly for some years; consequently he could take no part in the more boisterous plays and sports in which boys generally engage, and cultivated a taste for more quiet pursuits, thus unconsciously preparing himself for his great life-work. His father was a confectioner, and doubtless the taste awakened in the boy during these early years was nourished and strengthened by what he saw in this line of work, but more especially by the lessons in drawing he received from that excellent teacher, Schütz. In due course of time he was apprenticed to his uncle Martin, in Holland, a skilled manufacturer of porcelain stoves and house decorations. Here he remained nine years, learning and laying the foundation for his future successful career as an artist. Much of the work he had to do here was for churches. At the same time he had the advantage of further instruction in drawing by the well-known master, Nestorius Hense, copied illustrations found in Schnorr's pictorial Bible and tried his hand on original designs. His father, thinking that young Beck had already advanced far enough, and therefore unwilling to permit him to pursue his art studies any further, had him come home and take charge of a pottery-ware store. With a heavy heart he complied with his father's wishes; but, the business did not prove a success, and as a last resort he tried to turn the tide by an exhibit of ceramics at Meurer's art exposition at Hohenstein in 1863. This proved to be the turning-point in our young artist's life. True, as far as his immediate plans and hopes were concerned, they were not yet to be realized; but he became acquainted with Meurer and carried impressions home with him that proved of great service to him later, though for the present they were to be only dead capital laid up in memory's store. In the following year, 1864, they were to be utilized for the first time, when a younger brother, who was pastor of a Bohemian congregation, sought the help of the young artist for decorating the walls of his little church. Beck's wife, an enthusiastic and skillful embroideress, undertook

the work of preparing the altar cover and, by the aid of a few friends, succeeded well; the embroidery was in orange zephyr on green cloth,* the effect being very pleasing. Beck himself, however, being somewhat in doubt as to the merit of the work, submitted it to the historical painter, Professor Andreae of Dresden, who not only approved of it, but as opportunity offered spoke favorably of it, so that Beck soon received orders — the first from Hanover — for artistic embroidery for churches. Among those sending orders the countess Anna von Schulenburg, the founder of the Society for Paramentics in lower Saxony, deserves special mention. This work grew to such an extent that in 1867, Beck had to abandon his former business, in order to devote his full time and strength to this new, and to him far more congenial, occupation.

Years of zealous study and research combined with unrelaxing artistic work began now. From his correspondence with Löhe as well as his personal intercourse with Meurer and Andreae he derived much encouragement and help, which he necessarily had to seek elsewhere, since, besides its romantic surroundings, Herrnhut offered nothing whatever in this line. And still it did offer something! That particular feature in which Beck's sketches excelled all others was their biblical, Christian, churchly character — and this, as Beck well knew, was due to his surroundings, to the fact that he had grown up in this congregation. Every one of his works of art bears witness to the warmth of Christian conviction, a life as outlined by the Word of God, whilst in the case of those of others who know little or nothing about faith or a godly life, the feeling often creeps over one that they are only shapes and forms, to produce which is their "trade." Hence too we find that they move, as it were, in a circle, furnishing again and again the same, al-

* The following schedule of colors for the festivities of the ecclesiastical year will be of interest to all churches desiring to use appropriate altar cloths during the several seasons of the church year:

Advent until Christmas—Violet.

Christmas until Epiphany—White.

Epiphany until Septuagesima Sunday—Green.

Septuagesima until Good Friday—Violet.

Good Friday—Black.

Easter until Pentecost—White.

Pentecost and Trinity Festival—Red.

All Sundays after Trinity—Green or Red.

ready oft-repeated, figures and churchly symbols, drawn from the circle in which they move, the kingdom of nature. In Beck's productions, on the other hand, there is a thoughtful depth and individual treatment, a fine selection of passages, in short: spiritual thoughts. He himself, speaking as a true artist, says that he is simply imitating Moses, of whom it is said that he made all things "after the pattern which was showed him in the mount." True to his convictions, Beck never deviates from well-known and tried churchly and liturgical principles, although it often placed him in opposition to wishes and requests of a different kind. But often these very persons, becoming convinced, after talking the matter over with him, that he was right, thanked him for that firmness which before they had thought uncalled-for and inexcusable.

In connection with this firm adherence to the principles underlying his art designs, Beck manifested another trait of character worthy of mention. Notwithstanding the fact that many honors were bestowed on him — e. g. the large golden medal for skill in art and handicraft by the Saxon government in 1871; the title of Professor; the medal for fine taste by the Vienna exposition — he never aimed to be, or seem, more than he was, or to overstep the bounds of his calling. He had no desire to be more than an artist in the sphere of paramentics; as such he sought to excel. To this calling, to the exclusion of all else, he devoted all his energies. Not infrequently it happens that an architect, when asked to sketch a design for an altar cover, by his conduct, or the style of his design, makes the impression that in the planning and construction of the church he had exhausted all his resources; there is no energy for and no pleasure in this last work that is now hurriedly done. Or this and that stroke is wearily added yet. Looking at such a design anyone who knows anything about embroidery cannot help thinking that it is fortunate for the artist that he does not have to embroider it himself. In the first place it has to be adapted to the process of embroidering — which is often hard to do; sometimes it can not be done at all. In sketching his design the artist possibly had in mind the technique of a different class of artistic work, perhaps painting, sculpture or work in

bronze. Beck, on the other hand, knew and took into account the rules of embroidery, having his designs executed under his own eyes, in his own house, or if it had to be done by others, it was according to his advice and directions. His neat, chaste designs were all just right for the embroiderer, not only because they were exact, but because the technique was true and the effect had not been overlooked. In drawing his sketches Beck never forgot that each line he drew must be embroidered, and always knew how this could and must be done. Nor did he consent to furnish designs which could not be executed under his own supervision, or at least according to his advice. Thus Beck has labored up to this time, and is still active in his calling.

And now, after these three men, Löhe, Meurer and Beck, have worked hand in hand for nearly half a century, what is the condition of Paramentics? — I visit a ministerial brother in the country; a truly pious man, one who has passed through the school of affliction. It is Sunday. The Lord's Supper was to be administered. What an uncomfortable feeling comes over me when I see the altar. How it looks! On it there stands an array of bottles — a large number of communicants was expected — and the bread was in a somewhat torn white pasteboard box. The paraments — if we may dignify these products of the textile art with this name — are in keeping with those "sacred vessels."

I ask a pastor who is my kinsman to kindly show me his church. Our conversation touches on liturgy and church music, especially singing. I know of his efforts and achievements in this department. He is telling me about having practiced the *Te Deum*, and how, in responsive measures, it reverberates through the sanctuary — my eye falls on the altar; an old tattered cloth covers it. My friend, apologizing, says: We are in the country. Among farmers this will cause no comment. — I wonder! How can one be so highly educated in harmony, and yet lack so completely all harmony in his education, so that in church-music he sets the standard for himself and others so high, whilst in church-paramentics the very first principles are ignored, that, namely, everything should be clean, whole, not damaged. Is "the country" really to blame for this?

We enter the fine, old, richly furnished church of a city. Much has been done in the way of renovating this church. Everything makes the impression of being well preserved. True, it strikes us as somewhat strange that in this Gothic church all the wood-work of the organ-loft and the wainscoting are in the style of the Renaissance, whilst the new altar presents another shade of the same style — and, which is most remarkable of all, that after all this ornamentation in the style of the Renaissance, the frescoing should be in pure Gothic style. We hope that for all this there may have been good reasons, unknown to us. But when we examine the altar more closely and find it “ornamented” with a shabby velvet cover with gold embroidery quite black already, the broadest charity can no longer find any excuse. A congregation that will spend thousands in renovating its church, and then place on the altar a cover which not one of the worshipers would want to put on his own table — to put it mildly — has a good deal to learn yet. Certainly here, in the city, the excuse about “the country”, referred to above, cannot be offered.

Perhaps we shall find something better in a new church. It was carefully planned, and the plan skillfully executed by one of the best known church architects of modern times. But the parament! Embroidered in glass beads, one against the other, a heavy, fixed creation, the same for all seasons of the Church year. One naturally asks, why not make the whole front of the altar of stone? But, worst of all, this bead-embroidery represents, in the center a cross, on one side the moon and stars, on the other the sun. Anyone who solves this rebus will no doubt evolve the saying: From night to light through the cross!

But I cease. Any close observer can finish this depressing catalogue. Note especially the drapery of many of our pulpits; made of cloth or velvet; when the hand is laid heavily on the cushions a cloud of dust rises from them; and the chief ornament are the brass-headed tacks which remind one of coffin nails for Paramentics.

This sad state of affairs is all the more inexcusable, because there is no necessity for it: It might be said indeed that people themselves invite it. To bring about a

change we need but take from the treasure that is on hand. In hundreds of cases this has already been done. And Beck's help is noted in many of them.

Let us yet look at a few of his designs. Their description will of course be somewhat imperfect, but it is all we can give in the *MAGAZINE*. To be properly appreciated, these designs must be seen.

The first is a center-piece for an altar covering in a church at Ludwigslust. It is a cross terminating in palm leaves, indicative of peace. In the center is the monogram of Christ in Greek letters (*Ch* and *R*), on the sides *A* and *O*, representing Christ as the first and the last. In the gores there are grapes and ears of wheat as emblems of the Lord's Supper. The cross stands out in bright, strong colors from a dark green ground. In the whole embroidery gold tones prevail, combined in the most significant points with pure white.

The second is the center-piece of an altar covering for the Passion season, designed for use in a Gothic church. In the arms of the cross there are passion-flowers, emblems of the sufferings of Christ, in the gores thistles, emblems of punishment for sins, in the center the monogram of Jesus, namely the first letters of the name, after the style of the middle ages in Gothic Greek (*IHS*). It is embroidered on black cloth. The groundwork of the cross is light blue. In the embroidering, the cross, the margins, the monogram, the open flowers and the leaves of the passion-flowers are brought out by work in white or silver, the rest being wrought in a gold tone. The text and the thistles are embroidered on black cloth in tones of darker gold.

Again we see the embroidered center-piece for a red altar cover in a Romanesque church. Here is the triumphant Lamb of God, surrounded by the four cherubim spoken of in the prophecies of the Old and New Testament as the bearers of the divine throne, and who are generally regarded as types of the four evangelists. The Lamb and the banner are embroidered in white and silver; the inner circle around the Lamb and the evangelists is of light blue silk, the next of gold-brown silk, whilst the linear embroidery which serves as a border, as well as the various

plants with which it is ornamented, are wrought in gold silk on the principal groundwork of the parament.

Should any of the readers of the *MAGAZINE* desire to make a further study of Paramentics — and we trust that our pastors and teachers at least will wish to do so — they will do well to secure a little book entitled “Advice* for Securing and Taking Care of Paraments, by Th. Schäfer, Berlin. Reuther & Reichard. 1897.” Designs for paraments can also be secured from that master in this department, Prof. Beck in Herrnhut, as well as from Paramentic Associations, whose headquarters are usually in our deaconess institutions, where embroideresses are also employed. For instance at the deaconess house at Neuen-dettelsau, at Dresden, the Henriettenstift at Hanover, at Altona-Elbe, at Frankfurt a. M., etc. Paramentic Associations are to be found in lower Saxony, Mecklenburg, Blankenburg, etc.

Work in the interest of paramentics is work for a branch of ecclesiastical art, which, although it may not be the most showy or the grandest, appeals to the intellect and the heart, one that is well adapted to engage the thought and employ the hand of woman, and which constitutes a powerful factor in the value of all ecclesiastical art; it renders praise to God, and preaches to the congregation.

A MIRROR FOR PASTORS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF GUTHE BY REV. W. E.
TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

§37. USE OF THE BIBLE, ESPECIALLY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, IN THE SERMON.

Let the Old Testament with its law, through which comes the knowledge of sin, be employed as a schoolmaster unto Christ. “It does our congregations good, to receive also the morality of the Old Testament, yea now and then also — permit the word — the domestic bread of Solomon’s moral-

* Ratgeber fuer Anschaffung und Erhaltung von Paramenten von Th. Schaefer. Berlin. Reuther & Reichard. 1897.

ity. Luther has said in his genial way: 'The common people are pleased with nothing better than with the preaching of the law and the citing of examples, and nothing is more profitable. The preaching of God's grace and of justification is cold to their ears. If we preach on justification, the people sleep and cough. But when we begin to quote history and to relate examples, they prick up both ears, are quiet and listen attentively.' And a greater than Luther says: 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul' (Ps. 19, 7); is it then altogether impossible to call forth a similar confession from us and our hearers?"

Ewald has said: "Christ can only be understood in His relation to Israel." Very true. The preacher dare not separate the person of Christ from the messianic prophecies of the covenant.

How much could our age learn from the Old Testament for the right handling of social and political questions! P. Cassel says that the O. T. is the "true codex for the moral renovation of social and political conditions."

To people, who are prejudiced against the O. T., the pastor could make right plain its glory, if he would, for example, present to their attention the O. T. law for taking care of the poor. There is no law in the world, in which the poor are considered with more love than in that of the old covenant. It has been objected to all other laws that they were given rather to benefit the rich than to protect the poor. This reproach does not apply to the law of the old covenant. According to Deut. 15, 11-14, there were in Israel poor people, but no beggars. A distinction is made between the wicked, self-incurred poverty and that which is laid upon us by the disciplining, fatherly love of God. The preservative against pauperism and proletariat, recorded Deut. 15, 5 ff., cannot be told the congregation often enough. Begging is an impeachment of the congregation, whether because the poor have not heeded the voice of the Lord and have not held His commandments (Deut. 15, 5. 6), or because the wealthy members of the congregation have not fulfilled the duty of charity to their brethren (Deut. 15, 7. 8). He who diligently keeps in view the exhortations of God's Word, to withhold from the workmen nothing of what they have earned (Jer. 22, 13), to pay the

wages as soon as the work is done (Lev. 19, 13), to loan to the poor in his need without exacting usury (Ex. 22, 25) and to help him immediately (Prov. 3, 27, 28), furthers at the same time the economic welfare of the congregation. Should not the congregation be stirred to active charity if, especially in harvest-time, it be earnestly shown from God's Word that, according to the laws divinely appointed with reference to the poor, these poor were to share in the blessings of the harvest?

Read before the people appropriate passages in which gleaning is enjoined by God as the most natural way of supporting the poor (Lev. 19, 9, 10; Deut. 24, 19-22). Such passages give the preacher an excellent opportunity to show the congregation how exceedingly it is opposed to the law of God when nowadays the poor are forbidden to glean in the meadows, orchards, potato-fields and vineyards, and how God punishes this disobedience of the poor-law by an ever-increasing poor-tax. How well the Old Testament law provided for the poor can be proved to the congregation by the institution of the sabbatical year, whose spontaneous production belonged to the poor (23, 11). In the sabbatical year no debts could be collected (Deut. 15, 1, 2). Thus there was offered a safe-guard against usurers, who reap their harvest when others starve, who assail their debtors most when they know these to be in need. Let the congregation become acquainted with these instructions of the Word, and let the petition be added that our neighbor's year of scarcity be regarded as a sabbatical year, and that we take friendly notice of his momentary embarrassments. Let the preacher, as intercessor for the poor, point to the law respecting the sabbatical land when an effort is made to diminish their piece of sabbatical land and thereby, without desiring it, increasing pauperism.

How so much, which at first sight seems to possess only an historical interest for the theologian, can be made fruitful for the congregation, we can learn from this law concerning the sabbatical year. Israel was not a commercial, but an agricultural people. During the sabbatic year, however, the land could not be cultivated. An extraordinary amount of time was on their hands. But not for sloth. Israel was to have opportunity for devoting its attention to

that which abides eternally, when heaven and earth pass away; they were to have time for the highest duty of life, for the culture of the inner man, for sinking the spirit into the wonderful works of God, as well as for cherishing a happy, peaceful family life. In Deut. 31, 10-13 it was provided that during the sabbatical year the law should be read solemnly in the presence of men, women, children and strangers. During this year the parents paid special attention to instructing their children in the divine law. Then the duties and customs enjoined by the law were declared to the children, as well as the memorials of the land and the great deeds which God had done among His people, or also occurrences in their own lives, their own experiences of the friendly guidance of God were related in agreeable companionship. Among the Jews the school was still in the house. Religious instruction of children among us should be not only the business of teacher and pastor, but also of the parents. Does not the explanation of the object of the sabbatic year give the pastor excellent occasion for admonishing fathers and mothers to lead a holy, peaceable life, not to be engaged continually as Martha was, to take time for considering God's Word, for the religious training of their children, for family worship, for happy family life?

We can learn from people who rightly sink themselves into the Bible, how also from ceremonial statutes, which appear unprofitable for the sermon, honey may be drawn. The law, for instance, that the daughter of a stranger, who would be wedded to a Jew, must lay aside the garment of her captivity, pare her nails and cut her hair, can be used to disclose the truth: every soul, that desires that the Son of God should join it to Himself (Hos. 2), must remove the clothing of its captivity, that is, the old man, and put away everything that is not fit for the eyes of the Lord.

§38. APPLYING OF CHURCH HISTORY.

The preacher should also use church history for the edification of the congregation, for the elevation of the Christian mind and life.

Not seldom do passages of Scripture give the preacher occasion to turn church history to account in a very striking

manner. For example, 1 Thess. 5, 27, where the apostle writes: "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren," would offer opportunity for making the congregation acquainted with the anagnosis, the public reading of the sacred books in the regular assemblies of the first Christians for worship. Let the preacher show the congregation, that among the first Christians—who arranged their service according to that of the synagogue, where every Sabbath the paraschioth and haptoroth were publicly read,—the anagnosis of the New Testament books was so diligently adhered to, that even simple believers knew these writings by heart, so that they sometimes could correct the reader if he erred in a single word, as Eusebius expressly records. The sermon will gain in its refreshing power, if it makes use of Justin's testimony respecting the anagnosis, when he writes: "On the day called 'Sunday' all assemble, both those who live in the city and those who live in the country; then the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as possible. Afterward, when the reader has finished, the one presiding delivers an address to the assembly, encouraging and spurring on to imitation of these noble examples." After giving such information, the succeeding admonition to regular attendance upon divine service and to diligent reading of God's Word might more easily make an impression. What valuable grains of gold could be drawn forth out of the writings of the fathers! If the minister wishes to preach on 2 Cor. 6, 8-10, and present to the congregation the right Christian life, he can read the beautiful fifth chapter of the excellent letter to Diognetus, where it said of the Christians: "They are in the flesh, but they do not live after the flesh. They have their present dwelling on earth, but their citizenship in heaven. They obey the laws that are ordained and in their life go far beyond the laws. They love all men and are persecuted by all. They are unknown and are condemned; they are killed and are made alive; they are poor, yet make many rich; they suffer for want of all things and have everything in abundance; they endure disgrace and in their disgrace they are esteemed noble; they are defamed and are justified; men curse them and they bless; men revile them

and they give honor; they do good and are punished as evil-doers," etc.

If the minister has to preach on the high calling of Jesus' disciples in the world (say with Matt. 5, 13, 14, as a text), how well he can use the sixth chapter of the letter to Diognetus! There it is said: "What the soul is in the body, that Christians are in the world. The soul is distributed through all members of the body and the Christians through the cities of the world. The soul lives in the body, it is true, but is not of the body; and the Christians live in the world, but they are not of the world. The soul is preserved invisible in the visible body; and the Christians we truly see in the world, but their godliness remains unseen. The flesh hates the soul and contends against it, though it does the body no injury, because the soul restrains the body from serving fleshly lusts; and the world hates the Christians, who do it no hurt, because they oppose its pleasures. The soul loves the flesh, which hates it, and loves the members of the flesh; and the Christians love those who hate them. The soul is inclosed in the body, but it holds the body together, and Christians are kept in the world as in a prison, but they themselves hold the world together. The soul, itself immortal, resides in a mortal house, and Christians continue as guests in a corruptible existence and await the incorruptible life in heaven. The soul grows better if food and drink are withheld; and Christians, when they are punished, improve from day to day. God has put them into the position they occupy, and they dare not refuse."

Such chapters from the writings of the apostolical fathers were formerly read publicly in the divine services of the ancient Church. Are they not worthy of being communicated to our congregations also for their edification?

Or if the minister intends preaching on the Lord's Prayer, he will find no small number of gems in Tertullian's *de oratione* and in Cyprian's *de oratione dominica*. "The contemplation of great examples elevates," says Cicero. Then we should not neglect to hold before the eyes of the congregation the great men of the Christian Church, in whom the divine power of the Gospel rightly showed itself. The faith in the living God, who hears prayers and can do wonders, has in our time been largely lost. To people like

D. Strauss faith in the living God, in the answering of prayers, is "a strange crutch," they would stand man "on his own foundation and on the natural order of things." Passages like this: "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," they cannot understand and cannot bear. But cannot the most impressive and most convincing arguments for the truth of this passage be adduced from history, for example, from the life of Monica, from that of H. H. Francke, of a George Müller in Bristol? Reveal to the congregation the life of Monica, who through her prayers and tears so prevailed with God, that her heathen husband Patricius and her godless son Augustine were brought to thorough repentance. Relate in particular the answers to H. H. Francke's prayers while the orphan-house in Halle was building. Tell how the humble man of God began, trusting to his God, with a few dollars the gigantic structure, which covers two squares and still stands, how the world ridiculed the fool who dared to build without full coffers, how the overseer of the work came repeatedly to Francke with the complaint: "Our money is all gone," and how the builder, rich in his God, replied: "I am glad, for that is a sign God will again give us something; from childhood up I received a new pair of shoes when the old ones were tattered"; how, when need was greatest, God was nearest, how He often let just as much money as was needed on a certain day come to His faithful servant, even from foreign lands; how Francke lived to see the time, when 134 orphan children were raised under the care of ten overseers, 2,207 children and youths were educated gratuitously in the various schools by 175 teachers, 150 scholars and 225 poor students were daily fed from the kitchen of the orphanage.

FUNERAL SERMON.

[Preached at the funeral of an old Christian lady.]

Beloved:—Will the Lord care for me in old age? I am not better than many others whose declining years have been filled with bitter disappointment. So lament God's own children often. This is especially so, no doubt, when

one feels his vital powers waning, and knows that the vigor, prospects and courage of youth are things of the past. The Psalmist in our text voices this sensation. The gloom, the weakness, the forsaken condition of approaching age oppress him. To meet this condition let us consider

How to Come to a Blessed Death in a Good Old Age.

Live

I. In daily fear, and

II. In daily trust.

The Psalmist's prayer is proof that he is conscious of holding a treasure which he fears he may lose. He holds familiar intercourse with God. He comes to him boldly. This knowledge he has of God is a saving one. Without this it would be impossible to call upon God acceptably or really. The prayer may have been uttered in a season of weakness or despondency. Yet it is the pleading of a believing heart. A believing heart possesses salvation. It is therefore concerned lest this treasure be lost. This is the deep concern of the Psalmist. If this great gift be lost all is lost. And because of this treasure of salvation the child of God becomes the particular object of God's providence. About this too he is concerned. The Christian sometimes staggers at God's mysterious providence. If providence forsakes him his gift of salvation shall also perish. The former is a prop of the latter, as well as the latter secures the former. If these be gone then with doubt, and dread, and despair, man looks forward to his declining years and death. But of what should the believer be afraid as a cause of losing God's love and his own salvation? He is afraid of himself. How feeble is faith! How deceitful is the flesh! How many have made shipwreck of their faith! The shores along the sea of life are strewn with them. We must literally walk over them. They meet our gaze at every step. The same deadly influences which destroyed these people are at work in our own bodies and souls. We are deeply sensible of this. The believer is afraid of the world. How fascinating, how alluring, how insinuating! It lieth in wickedness and yet it dresseth itself in the most enticing forms. It finds in the flesh of the Christian a responsive chord. The flesh will not down. It reaches forth after the gaudy show,

after the defiling influences of the world. Satan is also to be feared. He is ever lying, and urging on to doubt and sin. He makes the world dazzling in its splendor. His cunning far surpasses that of all mankind combined. As there is real salvation, there is also real flesh to despise it. As there is a real Savior, so is there a real world to blind our eyes to His gracious goodness. As there is a real God over us, so is there a real devil to cause us to doubt His love.

These considerations lead the man of God to carefulness, to earnest concern for his soul, to watchfulness, to self-examination, to praying, to reading of the Word, to faithful use of the sacraments, to earnest daily duty, to loving association with God's people. These are the way and the means appointed by God and recognized by His children. This has been the experience of the deceased, and of untold numbers in the past, and of many now.

The treasures of faith become more valuable daily to the Christian. With greater clearness this worth is fixed in the soul. Faith clings with ever increasing strength to Jesus. Association with Jesus becomes more intimate. When the believer prays: forsake me not in old age, the treasure of life, as a costly pearl whose intrinsic nature is clearly discerned, is held with firmer grasp, and more tender solicitude. He devoutly and lovingly says:

"Jesus, Thou art mine forever,
Dearer far than earth to me."

God's faithfulness becomes more evident to the tried and chastened soul. This is true in spiritual things. Not only has our Father prepared salvation, but He has seen to it that it has been offered to us in the means of grace and sealed in our hearts. In all our weakness, waywardness, unthankfulness and unworthiness He has not once broken His promise to us. He has stood ready to help us under all circumstances, and even when we were cold and indifferent He followed us, held out His hands in pleading attitude and calls in words of wonderful tenderness to return to His love.

No less has the Father shown His goodness and faithfulness in temporal things. In general has He blessed us with all men. In particular He has followed us to provide for all our bodily needs. Trials came. In the sweat of

their brow His children have eaten their bread. That is a wholesome order of God. In this order food and raiment have been possessed. Faithful friends, pious children have been granted. Government has been better than we have in any way deserved. Every good gift enjoyed has come down from above. Every day more clearly the hand of God is discerned.

“Our God is true!—Never forget, my soul,
How kind and true He is!
Be true to God!—Let this thy life control
And be devoutly His!”

It is equally true, the power of the Word, the signification of Baptism, the sweetness of the Lord's Supper are more deeply appreciated, because their efficacy is more fully discerned. Instinctively the Christian turns to them for comfort, for instruction and strength. He lives in fellowship with Christ and God. When the storms of fear and anxiety threaten to crush, refuge is taken in the Rock of Ages. When the hauntings of age and of want, and of the loss of friends, and of God's faithfulness gather thick around, prayer, occasioned by such fears, throws us back upon the unchangeable and infinite love of God. “I will never leave thee nor forsake thee,” He says. “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,” the Master tells us.

“Can a woman forget her sucking child that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea they may forget, yet will I not forget thee.”

Thus in fear and trust this aged mother spent her life. Her fears becoming less and her confidence stronger until the end came, when she could say: “Yea though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me, Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.”

What an example for her children! What an example for us all! The power of grace is stronger than death. Amen.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XVIII.

AUGUST, 1898.

No. 4.

A PLEA IN BEHALF OF A FULL SERVICE.

BY REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

The services in use in the Lutheran Church are *The Early Service*, or *Matins*, *The Morning Service*, and *The Evening Service*, or *Vespers*. In the Morning Service provision is made for the Holy Communion. In order to provide these services with full material for all seasons and occasions, the Church has selected and arranged the following: Introits and Collects; Invitatories, Antiphons, Responsories; Special Collects and Prayers; General Prayers; Psalms; and Canticles. As Introits and Collects are provided for each Sunday and Festival, it is common to put them together where they can be found and used in their places. Certain portions of the services always recur, and certain parts are arranged to correspond with the day or occasion, and there are places for the introduction of a prayer or petition for special needs. This explains why it is that so much is needed for the full expression of devotion in Matins, Morning Service and Vespers.

In the Holy Communion itself, in order to adapt it to the Church year, there must be the Proper Prefaces; these come in after the words, "Almighty, Everlasting God," and before the words, "Therefore with Angels," etc., and are at hand and read so that there is no break in the service and the beauty of the service and its adaptability to the season at once appear. The flame of devotion and the feelings are both satisfied.

The same can be said in regard to all the services.

That we may see the feasibility and practicability of this plea, let us take a comparative view of the arrangement of the Morning, or Chief, Service, as it is presented in Dr. Schuette's book, *Propositions on Liturgics*, page 139, and the Protocol of the Conferences of the Joint Committee on a Common Service, adopted at Philadelphia, Pa., May 12-14, 1885, page 5.

DR. SCHUETTE.	PROTOCOL.
Introit.	Introit.
Kyrie.	Kyrie.
Gloria in Excelsis.	Gloria in Excelsis.
Collect.	Collect.
Epistle.	Epistle.
Hallelujah.	Hallelujah.
Gospel.	Gospel.
Creed.	Creed.
Sermon.	Sermon.
General Prayer.	General Prayer.
Prefatio.	Preface.
Sanctus.	Sanctus and Hosanna.
Exhortation and Prayer.	Exhortation.
Consecration and Lord's Prayer.	Lord's Prayer and Consecration.
Distribution, with Agnus Dei.	Agnus Dei.
Nunc Dimittis.	Distribution.
Thanksgiving Collect.	Collect of Thanksgiving.
Benediction.	Benediction.

It will be seen at a glance the agreement is almost perfect. The order in the printed column of Dr. Schuette's tabulation is given. A little difference manifests itself in regard to the use made of the parts, but the occasion for an argument is almost entirely removed. It will be noticed that the confessions of sins, as in use now, and places for hymns are not given. It is quite easy to introduce hymns at the right places. It is not so easy to introduce the confession and declaration of grace, so familiar to us; yet if the liturgical usage be kept before us so that the congregation responds to the introit "In the name of," etc., by the "Amen" as is proper, and let the Gloria Patri assume its proper place at the close of the psalm, there will be no jar or trouble in regard to the confession and declaration.

Attention is hereby called to a few things in regard to our Morning Service: The location and use of the Gloria Patri and Kyrie, and the expanded form of the Kyrie itself;

the transfer of the Collect from the place indicated by both forms given above; the lack of Introits, Collects and Proper Prefaces in the Holy Communion; the use of Gloria Patri, Kyrie, and Gloria in Excelsis (or Psalm) as separate and responsive parts.

The question is modestly suggested: Has liturgical usage been followed in these changes?

It will be seen that the most to be done in order to follow the outlines indicated will be to agree upon what is the best material for the respective parts.

The task is not now a very difficult one. Abundance of material is at hand. Liturgical usage and the needs of our Synod will enable any judicious committee, with the resources at its command, to supply such services as our growing demand requires.

There is a demand for fuller forms, especially in the evening service, and also for the material necessary to all occasions. Can and should our Synod supply it?

Objections to the publication of them in our hymnal.

1. First comes the question of cost. It is recognized that there is some call for the publication. But the claim is put forth that the call is not sufficient to warrant the outlay. Two things should be considered in this connection. All this material will make a nice little pamphlet that can be issued by itself and also can be put in the hymnal without any disturbance to the remainder of the book. By any proper activity in the congregations and among the young peoples' societies where the psalms will be especially valuable, it will be very easy to meet the expense. And secondly, if it is desirable and profitable to edification unto our people the little outlay should not be considered.

2. This is made almost impossible, it is claimed, since the congregations have the old and cannot be induced to buy the new. Why was that not an argument against our present book? I was pastor of a mission congregation where we had several dozens of the old in good shape. We found it no difficulty to get the people to buy the new, because it satisfied the needs much better. The congregation put aside the dozens it had for public use in the chapel and purchased the new. The old wear out, and though the process be slow, new books must take their places. Chil-

dren are being confirmed and people from the world are coming in every year. The new will be fuller and better and soon every congregation will get more and more of the new without any effort or special work, if the old is not kept in print, the new will find its way into the congregations.

3. It is claimed the people do not want it. By such a statement some think the case is made out against it. There is no doubt some do object to it, on one ground or another. Why do they object? That these forms are not Lutheran, or not Scriptural, or not edifying, or that there is still something better? Not one of these can be successfully maintained. Where then lies the objection? It is, that these services are too long and complicated and lack harmony in the parts. There can be no sound objection, on its Lutheranism, to a congregation using the shortened form of service, if the parts be retained in their order. Should those who want and will use the longer form be deprived of it by those who object to it? How can they use the longer if it is not in their hymnals? Is it fair and right to the Church, and to the world even, that the hymnal should not have the full forms of service, in the best shape, for those who wish it? It would be a great source of education to the people, and especially to the very ones who object to it. It is generally not a difficult task to get them, when they really love the Church and her history, to glory in the fact that their hymnal presents a great service, even as the Church has great doctrine.

It is a well-meant but relative statement that the people do not want the full forms of service. Has the case ever been properly put before the people? Here and there a congregation may have refused the use of the fuller forms. But we can safely say that as a body our people have not refused them. Most of them have not had a proper presentation of these fuller forms. Above all they have not had the services rendered in their midst in an intelligent, churchly and edifying manner that they might have an opportunity to know and judge. How can a people be said not to want a thing, such as a service is, when they have never been led to see and know it, and been educated by a sympathetic and appreciative pastor to value the services

as a most appropriate and blessed way to join the hosts of God in the adoration of His name!

In this particular much depends on the pastor and the way the matter is approached. A case in point may serve for illustration. People in a German congregation raised objection to the pastor wearing a gown. Later the same people joined an English congregation and even rejoiced when the pastor wore a gown and faced the altar in prayer, as it is proper to do. As soon as people enjoy a service the length is forgotten when it is within proper limits.

Some may say these forms are too much on the Roman Catholic and Episcopalian order for them to accept. They are the real, true and proper services of the Lutheran Church. The Episcopalians got their original service from the Lutherans; so that the two are alike to considerable extent because they are followers of our Church and not we of them.

The services of the ancient pure Church were corrupted by the Roman Catholics, as Church doctrine was; the services were a common heritage of God's people and not of the Roman Catholics. Our reformers purified the services as they did the doctrines. We do not give up Jesus nor His cross because the Roman Catholics have them.

Recently I met one man who objects to our present morning service. He is not a member of any church, but prefers to be a Lutheran. He said if we returned to the service in the old hymnal he would come to our service. I attempted to reason the case with him, but he said any effort to change his mind was useless. I trust his disposition is not prophetic.

I have found that such people will listen to and enjoy and praise the well-rendered anthems of choir and chorus, when thereby the services are made longer than any of the forms, and when these anthems do not harmonize with the remainder of the service and even jar with the festive Church season.

4. The congregations do not use what we have; why give them longer forms? This statement is only partially true. There are a goodly number that do use them and the number is yearly increasing. Why are the services not

used? Time does not permit mention of all the reasons known. Some congregations did not have the services for many years of their existence, and got into the habit of permitting the pastor to attend to all the services except the singing of a hymn or two. In many cases do not the pastors forget the service is a worship and that it is a part of their office to educate and build up the people in the appreciation and use of the service? How many pastors have spoken of the services, their forms and purposes, and thus sought to awaken in the people a desire for and an appreciation of the beauty of the worship of the sanctuary?

5. The people should not be disturbed by such a change, some say. It disturbs and distracts. It is not pleasant to disturb people, especially in their devotions and in the forms of their devotion. But if better and fuller forms are given them, and forms that fan devotion and develop and build up the people, it is not really a disturbance but a help, and when properly explained will so be looked upon by most of the people.

That which increases the spiritual life and more fully supplies the need of the soul cannot disturb but must heighten the enjoyment, though for a little time it does not seem so easy and familiar.

These statements have seemed desirable in view of the hope that by a careful consideration opposition to the full forms may gradually fade. The consideration of the reasons for the advance to the use of the fuller we may expect to be rewarded by a gradual increase in interest and use until the congregation that does not employ the whole service will be the exception and not the rule.

Reasons for putting them in the Hymnal.

1. They are the services which correspond with the blessed Augsburg Confession and deserve a place alongside of it; and there is no better way in which the real life and glory of the Church can be brought before the people with the hope of an appreciation of it than in the services. We glory in our Augsburg Confession and print it in our hymnal; the full orders of worship should also appear as a proper representation of the faith and life of the Church and for the use of all who wish them,

2. These services belong to the people, and fidelity to the people and to their interests demands that they be furnished with these treasures of the faith and life of the Church in their hymnals, where they can have the best use of them. We want our people to worship when they are in the Lord's sanctuary; we want them instructed and built up in their homes. These forms will give them the material in which to cultivate devotion and instruct them in true worship. These forms are the ripened fruit of faith and devotion and millions have used and enjoyed them.

3. Our Synod stands foremost in doctrine and confession and practice. In the services this cannot be said. I am not of the number who think a man is a Lutheran, and a very good one, because he has and uses a truly Lutheran service, any more than I think a man is a Christian because he refuses tobacco and does not openly blaspheme God's name. The fact that some people have a full and true Lutheran service, though they do not know and confess and defend the most precious doctrines of the Church, does not prove that we should not have the best and fullest service the Church has given to her children; the service that stands on the plane with the doctrine and confession.

4. There must be some form if a hymnal is to publish it. Otherwise the worship cannot be common. When a form is published, why not give the best and fullest? Those who want a short form have an easy task to use what they desire in the proper order. But how about those who want the full forms? They cannot fill up what is lacking with any degree of satisfaction. Shall those who desire and can and will use these full forms be forever deprived of them or be compelled to substitute and fill up in private ways, and at times under the criticism of Synod, just because some do not want and will not use them? By the fuller forms all can be satisfied, and there will be greater uniformity and growing interest in our worship.

It is hoped that these and other considerations will move Synod, at its approaching meeting, since the material is at hand, to arrange for the publication of the services and all parts necessary to their full use, in a separate publication and to be bound in the hymnal for all who so wish. As a member of the committee appointed in 1892 by Joint Synod an appeal is hereby made for such action,

THE BIBLICAL CONCEPTION OF σαρκ.

BY REV. PROFESSOR W. D. AHL, ST. PAUL, MINN.

It is a well known fact that the writers of the New Testament in adopting the Greek language as the vernacular of their thought, did and could not bind themselves strictly to the commonly accepted meaning of every word they had to make use of, for the simple reason, that they had to deal with thoughts not of human wisdom and knowledge, but of the wisdom and knowledge of the Eternal Godhead of which human mind could have no comprehension and for which therefore, it did not need language. The holy men of God then, not finding words adequate to express the great and sublime thoughts of God they were to teach and not wishing to create a new language, made use of the one extant, the more so as this was the language through which they could reach the largest possible number of people. In doing this, however, they very often had to put a meaning in the word to be used, far above the one received; they had, as it were, to infuse these words with their spirit and with their ideas, to elevate the old heathenish language so as to be capable of expressing the eternal thoughts of the Eternal Godhead. Though this process was begun about three hundred years before by the Greek translators of the Old Testament, the authors of the Septuagint, and though it cannot be denied, that the New Testament writers were greatly assisted by their work, that work was merely preparatory. Their language differs, as Cremer remarks, from that of the New Testament writers "as the well-meant and sedulous attempt of a pupil from the steady and creative hand of the master." So then the fact remains, that the language of the New Testament is peculiar only to itself. No person, therefore, could correctly understand the holy writers, as long as he would adhere but to the classical usage of a word. The meaning to be conveyed may vary according to the subject treated of. The sense of a certain word must be determined by its connection and by the whole drift of the thought to be conveyed. From the above it will be clear that in trying to get at the Biblical meaning of the word σαρκ, or "flesh", we must go

beyond the classical use of the word. Now it is not my intention to give an exhaustive treatment of all the different ideas and shades of ideas which might be found in connection with this word — a task above the reach of my time and my but very limited acquaintance with the subject — my aim is simply to set forth that sense of the word, which is peculiar to the New Testament and whereby it distinguishes itself from its classical usage. A careful survey of the different Scripture passages convinces us, that σάρξ besides its commonly received physical meaning has also and predominantly so an ethical sense. There is no doubt, σάρξ is taken in the New Testament also in its proper physical sense, denoting the physical substance of the animal body of man and beast. This is seen from Luke 24, 39: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see me; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." The passage is so clear, that it needs no further comment. In this same sense St. Paul takes it 1 Cor. 15, 39: "All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one flesh of men, and another flesh of beasts," etc.

There are other passages, where we must attribute to the word "flesh" a somewhat broader meaning. When St. Paul tells the Colossians, that he is "present with them in the spirit, though he be absent in the flesh" he evidently has in mind a double presence, the one in the body and visible to the senses, and the other invisible, in thought, in mind and prayer. Here then *sarx* is used to denote that part of man which is visible to the senses, his outward appearance as distinguished from its inner, spiritual side, the soul. It is "*pars hominis ἄλογος* contrasted with *τὸ λογικόν*." This same meaning we also find Col. 2, 1; Rom. 2, 28. 29.

In other passages the word can be taken for the body of man in general, the whole being designated by the part, as being its main substance and characteristic. In this sense it is nearly equivalent to *σῶμα*. Among such passages we reckon 2 Cor. 7, 5, where Paul says of himself, that his flesh, i. e. his body had no relief; 2 Cor. 4, 11: "For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh." 2 Cor. 12, 7: "That I should not be

exalted over much, there was given to me a thorn in flesh," etc.

Going a step further, we find *sarx* assume the signification of living beings generally, including their mental nature, man taken in his entirety. Rom. 3, 20 the apostle declares: "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified," and 1 Cor. 1, 19, that "no flesh should glory before God." Cf. also Luke 3, 6; Eph. 5, 29; Gal. 2, 16; Matt. 24, 22.

Connected with this idea and based upon it, the word "flesh" is used to denote the whole earthly side of man's life with all the conditions and relations dependent on it. This sense is to be found in passages like Phil. 1, 24: "Yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sake." Heb. 5, 7 it is said of Christ that "in the days of His flesh" He has offered up prayers and supplications. 2 Cor. 10, 3: "For though we walk in the flesh (i. e. live in this world) we do not war according to the flesh." Gal. 2, 20: "And that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith." Here we might introduce also passages like Phil. 3, 3. 4. and Philemon 16, and others.

In its non-ethical sense *sarx* finally signifies human nature itself and the peculiarities of the same, but yet without reference to its sinful condition. So 1 John 4, 2. "Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus is come in the flesh is of God." (Cfr. 2 John 7.) John 1, 14: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Rom. 1, 3: "Who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh." Rom. 6, 19: "I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh." Gal. 1, 16: "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." Matt. 16, 17: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee."

Now all these significations of *sarx* are of minor importance and mostly of such a character that they do not need further elucidation. It will, therefore, be sufficient to have called attention to them. But there are passages in the New Testament, especially in the writings of St. Paul, where all these significations will not suffice, passages — and they are rather frequent — which will convince even a sceptic that there *sarx* is used to convey some ethical idea. That this ethical element is not very flattering to

humanity no one will deny. The whole tenor of such passages shows too plainly that something morally bad, something sinful in man shall be conveyed thereby. So far theologians all agree, but when they come to define this something, to determine its nature, then we find them to differ widely in their opinions. From the early beginning of Christianity up to our times there have been not a few men, who found in *sarx* nothing else indicated than the sensuous, i. e. the carnal nature of man, its impulses, its desires and appetites. They claim that the very choice of the word used is proof enough, that this sinful something must be limited to the sensuous part of man, that in it sin has its seat and that from it sin originates. Now by this they do not mean to say, that sensuousness itself is in itself sinful, for that would indicate, that sin is embodied in the very nature of man, that it is really a part of him. Then also the fault would be with God who made man not only a spiritual but also a bodily, and as such necessarily also a sensuous being; then every creature with such an animal body would be subject to sin on account of being in the body, yea, then all the impulses, desires and appetites of man and brute would be sinful in themselves, an opinion too absurd to be entertained by any intelligent being. What these men mean when they refer *sarx* to the sensuous side of man is this: man is created by God a psychico-physical being, that is to say, he is not only spirit, but also body, and as body mainly a sensuous being. In the normal state the spirit, as the principle of life and man's nobler part is the ruling power, using this sensuous body as his organ of activity. As long as this unison between the spirit and the body is not disturbed, man is in his normal state. But as soon as this unison is disturbed, as soon as the sensuous impulses and emotions assume the power over the faculties of the soul or spirit, man becomes sinful. The spirit has lost its control and the sensuous powers have obtained dominion, a state which, of course, is not compatible with man's high position, and in which man has been lowered to the brute. This abnormal state is called *sarx*, and therein we must find the essence of sin. This view we find in different modifications, some of them coarser and some finer. Against all of them we have to guard ourselves. In the first place, such an opinion would seem to include an orig-

inal defect of the spirit which from its very beginning would not have had sufficient strength to retain the supremacy given it. It is anyhow hard to understand how the spirit, being the highest and noblest part of man, could be made subject — and in most men continually be subject — to that which is but an inferior part of man, to those sensuous desires. On the other hand, does it not seem, as if there were with regard to the sensuous side of man a concreated inclination for usurping the powers of the spirit? for the spirit itself, so the defenders of this doctrine claim, is still the same as it was before the fall; it is without sin and willing to do what is right and just. In the execution of its volitions, however, it is hampered by the predominancy of the sensuous powers which by the fall of man have been affected by sin. But is it really altogether impossible, even for a non-Christian, to check and to restrain those sensuous appetites so as to keep them within their proper bound? How then could we account for men like Socrates, Plato and many more? Can we say, that with them the sensuous and sensual appetites were predominating? It is true, by those theologians these heathen are put on the same footing with Christians; but just this shows the rationalistic tendency of those theologians.

Now let us even go a step further. If this sinful *sarx* is limited merely to those gross sensual desires, how could it yet be attributed to the regenerated, whose spirit is strengthened and assisted by the Spirit of God? With this divine assistance man's spirit ought surely to be able to regain its control. And therewith the proper relation would again be established and man be restored to his normal state. Is such the case? Does not the *sarx* remain in man until death?

Again, if sin is nothing else than the preponderance of the sensuous emotions over the spiritual, would not asceticism and unrelenting castigation of the body be the best remedy for this disorder? But experience tells us a different story. Still another question impresses our mind. If sin is identical with this *ἀραξία* of the sensuous desires, wherein then does it consist in the wicked angels who are devoid of body and consequently also of sensuous emotions? Or is there a specific difference between the sin of man and that of the fallen angels? It is true, a spirit could

never be called *sarx*, because *sarx* has always some reference to bodily beings. And in these the sensuous emotions are a great factor. So it can not be denied, that in sinful man also this sensuousness is of great importance; for only through the organs of sense can the interior life of man manifest itself. But the Scriptures neither identify *sarx* with the material body nor do they associate sin exclusively or predominantly with the same. On the contrary, *sarx* designates the whole being of man as alienated from God and given to sin. It covers, therefore, the entire domain of our fallen nature, "not merely the lower forms of sensual gratifications, but all the highest developments of the life estranged from God, whether physical, intellectual or aesthetic." So then not only the sensuous part of man is corrupted by sin, but also — and even more so — all those faculties in him which we commonly call soul or spirit. And because these higher faculties have been corrupted, because our reason is darkened and our will perverted, therefore also these sensuous appetites which in themselves were neither right nor wrong, have become affected with sin. The mind or spirit of man is the real agent which urges the body to action and which is, therefore, responsible for them. The body is only the organ of its manifestation, and since the soul of man has become affected with sin, the body also or the flesh has become the seat of sin's manifestation. Flesh, then denotes our fallen and sinful nature, because man appears through it and manifests his nature by it. It is neither the body exclusively nor the spirit.

This conception of *sarx* does not exclude that in some instances special stress may be laid upon the sensuous side of man's corrupted nature. As we have stated before, this sensuous side has become a great factor in the development of sin. In turning away from God, man has turned from the fountain and author of all life and light, a step which has made him "gott-los" and brought him under the bondage of the world, for "gott-los", i. e. "without God", finds but its positive expression in the phrase "in the world and of the world." Having rejected God, in whom he had found all bliss and happiness, man has lost the true object of his life. But man is so constituted, that he can not live without such an object. If he does not find his gratification in God, he will seek it elsewhere. Now there is but one

resource, the world and its pleasures; of these he cannot partake except through the organs of sense, and thus the sensuous organism becomes the means of gratifying man's debased and fallen nature; hence, also, the great influence, which is assigned to the sensuous part of man. But then we ought not to be surprised, when in the writings of the New Testament this side also of man's nature is set forth. So too, the word "flesh" sometimes has special reference to this lower part of man, reflecting especially upon the sensual appetites. This construction of *sarx* we find in 2 Pet. 2, 10, where the apostle speaks of "them that walk after the flesh in the lust of defilement." Of these same he declares verse 18 that "they entice in the lusts of the flesh by lasciviousness, those who are just escaping from them that live in error." The same construction might be found: 1 Pet. 2, 11; Rom. 7, 5; 13, 14; 1 John 2, 16; Jude 23; Eph. 2, 3, although it cannot be denied, that here too *sarx* can be construed so as to cover both sides of man's corrupted nature. And in this latter sense it is taken usually. A look at a few of the more important Scripture passages will clearly show this. We begin with Col. 2, 18: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind." The passage presents some difficulties. There are not only different readings — some manuscripts omitting "not" before "seen", etc. — but also different opinions concerning the angel-worship mentioned by the apostle. Yet for our purpose these differences will not interfere very much. As the context shows the passage has reference to certain false teachers in Colosse, who by an affected humility sought to prepare the way for their pernicious heresies. In the first place, they proclaimed a rigid asceticism which in its unsparingness of the body demanded from all alike an arbitrary abstinence of food and drink, thus subjecting the body to an unbearable burden. This of course gave them a show of special piety and humility, much to their delight. To this false asceticism was added a false and undue adoration of angels. This angel-worship may have taken place as a kind of intercessory worship or else as the alleged means of receiving new mani-

festations from the other world. The first idea would involve on the one hand a show of deep humility and on the other an affectation of supreme reverence for God. Filled with awe at the thought of the Majesty on High and bowed down by the consciousness of their sins they would not dare to approach the throne of God, but look unto the angels as to their intercessors. If we accept the second interpretation, their worshipping of angels would serve their craving for further and more extended revelations. Pretending not to be satisfied with the manifestations given, they would "intrude into those things which they had not seen," attempt to open up the invisible world, in order to receive more light and to attain to a peculiar wisdom and sanctity. In both cases their affected humility was but spiritual pride in its worst form, "pride dressed up in the disguise of lowliness." Now it is plain, that in these false pretensions of the Collossian heretics there is nothing which could be called sensual or carnal in usual acceptation of the word; they were rather of a spiritual nature, coming from the *νοῦς*, and just this *νοῦς* the apostle calls *νοῦς τῆς σαρκός*. So it is clear that here *sarx* is used for the higher faculties of soul and spirit, or for the "higher reason" of man, as following the dictates of its own thoughts in opposition to the thoughts of God. — Gal. 5, 19 St. Paul enumerates as works of the flesh: fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, revellings and such like. Here the apostle makes mention of four classes of sins: 1) sins of lust: fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness (3); 2) sins of idolatry: idolatry, sorcery (2); 3) sins of contentiousness: enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings (8); 4) sins of intemperance: drunkenness, revellings (2). Of these only five (first and fourth class) are what might be called "carnal" sins in the common acceptation, whilst twice that number (classes two and three) have reference to the inner life and to the thoughts of man, and yet they all are works of the flesh. This ought to be proof enough, that *sarx* must cover the entire domain of our corrupted and sinful nature. Dr. Luther says of this passage: "This place alone doth sufficiently show what Paul meaneth by the flesh. . . . Hereby it is plain that Paul calleth flesh

whatsoever is in man, comprehending all the three powers of the soul; that is, the will that lusteth, the will that is inclined to anger, and the understanding. The works of the will that lusteth are, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, and such like. The works of the will inclined to wrath, are quarrellings, contentions, murder, and such other. The works of understanding or reason, are errors, false religions, superstitions, idolatry, heresies, that is to say, sects, and such like. It is very necessary for us to know these things; for this word is so darkened in the whole kingdom of the pope, that they have taken the work of the flesh to be nothing else but the accomplishing of fleshly lust, or the act of lechery; wherefore it was not possible for them to understand Paul. But here we may plainly see that Paul reckoned idolatry and heresy amongst the flesh, which two (as before we said) reason esteemeth to be most high and excellent virtues, wisdom, religion, holiness and righteousness, Paul (Col. 2) calleth it the religion of angels. But, although it seem to be never so holy and spiritual, yet it is nothing else but a work of the flesh, an abomination and idolatry against the gospel, against faith, and against the true service of God."

Of special importance are those passages, where *sarx* is used as antithesis to *πνεῦμα*. In nearly all of these passages (Matt. 26, 41; John 3, 6; Rom. 7, 14; 8, 1-14; 1 Cor. 3, 1; Gal. 3, 3; Gal. 5, 16-23; Gal. 6, 8. 9*) *πνεῦμα* is either the "Holy Spirit", the "Spirit of God", or what is more generally the case, the principle of the new life given by God, the life-spirit of the regenerated man, the "new man." Now this very contrast enables us to get at a clear understanding of the term *sarx*. Whether *πνεῦμα* be taken as the "Holy Ghost" or as the "new life-spirit of man", in both cases *sarx* must mean the whole of man. In the first case, *sarx* is all that in man which is opposed to the "Spirit of God", to the "Holy Ghost." Now no Christian will say, that this opposition against the "Spirit of God" arises only from the lower sensuous and sensual self and not also from

* Rom. 1, 14; 1 Tim. 3, 16; 1 Pet. 3, 18 refer to Christ, and have, therefore, no bearing upon our subject. 1 Cor. 5, 5; 2 Cor. 7, 1; Gal. 4, 29; 1 Peter 4, 6 may be conceded to be "in dubio," so that Col. 2, 5 is the only place where *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα* have to be taken as the two constituent parts of man, equivalent with body and soul.

the very bottom of his soul. It is the whole man, as far as he is unregenerated, which strives against the Spirit. If *πνεῦμα* is taken as identical with the "new life", the "new man", then *sarx*, being the antithesis to it, can mean nothing else than the "old life or the old man", i. e. man without the Spirit of God, and therefore as corrupted and sold under sin. This also explains, why *sarx* and *πνεῦμα* are such polar antitheses, that the one is contrary to the other. (Gal. 5, 17) And this conception of *sarx* alone corresponds to the analogy of faith. Therefore also, all our great theologians have almost universally adopted this construction of *sarx*. Luther especially has defended and upheld it, wherever he found occasion, in proof of which I will cite another passage from his commentary on the Galatians, where he treats of the subject in his well-known and masterly manner. "Non enim caro concupiscit, nisi per animam et spiritum, quo vivit, sed spiritum et carnem intelligo totum hominem, maxime ipsam animam. Breviter, ut dem crassissimam similitudinem: Sicut carnem sauciam aut morbosam utrumque appello, sanam et morbidam (nequi enim ulla est tota morbus), quæ, in quantum incipit sanari et sana est, sanitas vocatur, ubi vero vulnus aut morbus reliquus est, morbus vocatur, atque ut morbus seu vulnus reliquam sanam carnem impedit, ne perfecte faciat, quod caro sana faceret: ita idem homo, cadem anima, idem spiritus hominis, quia affectu carnis mixtus et vitiatum est, quatenus sapit, quæ Dei sunt, spiritus est, quatenus carnis movetur illecebris, caro est, quibus si consenserit, totus caro est. . . . Totus homo est, qui castitatem amat, idem totus homo illecebris libidinis titillatur. Sunt duo toti homines, et unus totus homo. Ita fit, ut homo sibi ipsi pugnet contrariusque sit, vult et non vult. Atque hæc est gloria gratiæ Dei, quod nos fecit nobis ipsos hostes. Sic enim superat peccatum, sicut Gedeon superavit Madian, gloriosissimo videlicet triumpho, ut hostes se ipsos trucident." (Editio Erlangensis, tomus III, p. 418. 19.)

A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE LUTHER LEAGUE.

BY REV. E. L. S. TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

The Luther League is a factor of Church life which cannot be ignored. Whatever be thought of it the fact is before us that the League lays claims to recognition by the Church in her future developments.

We are not speaking here of the societies of young people organized within the local congregation and under control of the individual congregation, be they called Luther Leagues or otherwise.

We have in mind those organizations composed of delegates from these home societies or from the congregations and which are aiming for synodical or even inter-synodical recognition.

The claim is forcibly presented that the League means well and only seeks the welfare of the Church and proposes to be simply a humble and industrious handmaid in the upbuilding of the Lord's kingdom. No word is here said nor thought entertained against the sincerity and the good intentions and aims of the promoters of the League.

It is said to foster zeal and love for the Church and synod by an educational awakening. The history, character and offices of the Church are subjects of study. More thorough, systematic, popular and persistent instruction in God's Word is given.

Acquaintanceship shall be formed through the League, among the young people of different congregations and parts of the synod or Church, whereby a better ruling, more unity, and larger coöperation shall be cultivated. Marriages among people of the same faith are thus to be encouraged and made easier, and in the same measure mixed marriages are to be discouraged and prevented. To bring out the latent talent and gifts, literary and spiritual, is one of the aims of the League. Essays on various topics, discussion of subjects, recitations and the like are the avenues through which this latent talent shall be harnessed to do work in the Church. The plea of self-defense is also offered as a reason for such organization. The sects around us,

and Lutheran Synods, as well, have their organizations of young people, therefore for self-preservation the League is necessary.

Our inability to yield a hearty consent and join in hearty coöperation with the League proceeds chiefly from the conviction that the League does not naturally grow out of the divine conception of the Church. The Church, congregation, and the family are divinely established units, which are made to do secondary and supplementary service to the new ideas of the day.

What is necessary to enlist the whole life and energy of the Church in a project is the plain, simple, Scriptural proof, without any hair-splitting distinctions, or the accumulated wisdom of the Church growing out of her historical development, or both of these, that the movement is a natural outgrowth of the divine idea of the Church and family, and is demanded by the imperative needs of the same.

It seems to us that when a congregation or individual has once clearly grasped the divine conception of Church and family and has set as his aim the advancement of the same on lines consonant with this ideal, he will be very slow to adopt methods and organizations which in any way obscure such aim. The institution of Children's day and parochial schools are cited as examples to justify the existence of the League. Whenever it is attempted to prove that they are only of like origin and need with the League it will be time to seriously look into the question.

It will certainly be apparent after mature deliberation that an organization like a synod — argument in favor of which is here deemed unnecessary — can and should be made to serve not only every general, but every urgent and peculiar public interest of the Church. Any other organization which partly or wholly covers the territory or parallels its efforts must only be a cause of weakness and embarrassment. The time, expense, attention, energy and interest must in time veer to the one to the neglect of the other. The novelty of a thing does not always last. The multiplication of machinery requires increased force and time. The manifold duties of a busy pastor, especially, and also of congregations are not favorable to the successful carrying on of such assemblies of general bodies like

the League when there is not a clearer demand for them than is now manifest.

Looking at the people who largely constitute such a body and give it standing and force, the necessity for such an organization seems to dwindle down to almost naught. Leading men and women in the church, people in the noon-day or perhaps even in the afternoon of life, those who are supposed to be the most settled, the best gifted, and least needing such an organization make up very largely the number and vigor of the League. One would suppose such people were active in the congregation and in and through the same and synod were doing their full share of all Church work. While it is a fact that without this element the League would have no standing at all and would be nothing more than a public menace to the Church while it lived, and would likely have a mushroom existence, yet from the fact that the League is so constituted it certainly is for this reason unnecessary where there are both congregational and synodical gatherings and conventions in which all the talents and all the wisdom of all the people can be fully utilized in all Church questions and activities. What would our young people from fourteen to twenty — speaking with all respect and love for them — do in organizing and conducting a general body of Leaguers. Doubtless, they constitute a large minority of such bodies. Those then who especially need the greatest care of the Church are those who derive little direct benefit from the League. What pressing need is there for a League composed of those who are supposed to be fixed in their faith and active in family and congregational life and in synodical work. Every want of the soul, of congregational life, of synodical and, therefore, of every churchly effort is met, and this in the way of the divine ideal, without the League. And a congregation which has for its aim the development of all its resources, starting out from the congregational idea and keeping this constantly before it and looking upon the family as a divine unit which is to be edified through an effort directly made in the home, and which is endeavoring to perform its wide duties to the world through the synod, will be slow to abandon such a course to run after organizations whose claims, to say the least, are shadowy.

It seems to us the only aim which will make the League a power and which will hold it together and inspire it with zeal is that larger and arbitrary one which looks for union by crossing synodical lines and is therefore an outgrowth of union sentiments and likely of unionism. It seems like a preposterous thing that a League should make that an object which impliedly condemns the positions of its several synods, and disregards the wisdom and conservatism of old and wise leaders in matters of Church union. Many of our teachers are not governed by prejudice and bitterness, much less by a love for error, though they have gone through struggles for the faith, and their deeper and clearer insight into real and God-pleasing Church union we can in no way afford to despise. We can see no other abiding aim for the League because everything is provided for in the Scriptural idea of family and congregational life and in the wise arrangement of synods.

The question of self-defense is one of little moment. The time is here for the Lutheran Church to employ her own methods, pursue her own policy and be in the van in all true Church life and development. While she is to recognize genuine progress wherever she may find it and profit by it, yet her foundations have been so widely and deeply laid, and many of our fathers have built so wisely and well thereupon that she can safely continue to build with the same means and after the same ideals, in the same spirit and with increased zeal and love, and thus employ every scintilla of strength and the highest gifts and wisdom and be her own natural self.

We venture also the prediction that those synods which recognize the family and congregation as the divinely appointed establishments for the salvation of souls and for their betterment here, and with the wants of both before them, and which concentrate all their power and energies, using all their publications for this purpose, inspiring all their students with these truths, firing all pulpits with these themes, imbuing all pews with these facts, awakening the members to congregational consciousness, and penetrating all homes with the uplifting sense of their rights and duties, will in the end be the stronger, and will be able to do more for the Master's glory, than those who are weak enough to be taken captive by any or all organizations which pro-

pose to do any or all of the synod's work along lines of effort not strictly her own. Such a consummation is worthy the effort and struggle.

FAITHCURE AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.*

BY REV. R. C. H. LENSKI, A. M., SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

There is reason enough for us to investigate the principles and works of faithcure and of Christian Science. Both continue to spread in various directions, and have entered also among our own people. Great harm is sure to result, if we do not forearm ourselves, and meet these delusions, when they make their appearance, as they should be met. There is something seductive in both, liable to captivate and delude those who are not firmly grounded in the Word of God and enlightened by sound investigation and reason. Many have been led astray, more will follow, but our people should stand firm and invincible.

In presenting the following propositions and their brief elaboration we have freely used the work of men who have devoted years of study to both subjects, who have spared neither time, nor pains, nor expense to search out the truth, and whose abilities and success have been widely recognized. At the same time, however, we have carefully tested and tried their investigations and results, being careful to follow them only where they led us aright. The Word of God is made the touchstone at every turn, and this the more readily as all parties concerned have felt themselves constrained to appeal to the Word or to answer its declarations.

The result is embodied in the following propositions:

- I. Both faithcure and Christian Science are essentially like the works effected by pagan sorcerers, Roman shrines, fountains, or priests, divine healers of all kinds, magnetizers, and others of similar character; differing only in their explanations, philosophy, outward procedure, skill and fame and measure of success thereon dependent.

*To be submitted to Western District for discussion.

- II. Both faithcure and Christian Science flagrantly contradict the Word of God in their philosophy and practice.
- III. Both faithcure and Christian Science work great injury to the body and especially to the soul.

I.

a) Faithcure and Christian Science have certainly performed some cures, so have sorcerers, Roman shrines, fountains, and priests, all sorts of divine healers, magnetizers, and many others of similar character.

It would be hardly possible for faithcure and Christian Science to find many adherents without at all working cures. Some have undoubtedly been cured of certain ailments, some have been alleviated. In fact, by pointing to these cures they maintain and spread their influence among the common people especially.

When we say that some cures have been wrought, we are far from admitting all that they claim in regard to any single instance of cure, or in regard to the extent of their cures. The patient cured may not have had the disease at all which he thought he had and which others, even doctors, supposed he had. "The diagnosis of the most skilful physicians may be in error. Post-mortems in celebrated cases have often shown that there had been an entire misunderstanding of the malady. Hysteria can simulate every known complaint: paralysis, heart-disease, and the worst forms of fever and ague. Hypochondria, to which intelligent and highly educated persons of sedentary habits brooding over their sensations are liable, especially if they are accustomed to read medical works and accounts of diseases and of their treatment, will do the same. . . . Especially in women do the troubles to which they are most subject give rise to hysteria, in which condition they may firmly believe that they are afflicted with disease of the spine, of the heart, or indeed of all the organs. . . . Within 8 years a 'regular' physician died, the cause, as he supposed on the authority of several examinations, being consumption. A post-mortem showed his lungs sound, and his death to have been caused by diseases the result of the enormous quantities of food and stimulants he had taken to 'fight off

consumption.'"* Dr. Vincent of New York gives the following: "I was told of a case at St. Luke's Hospital in this city (New York): a woman with a swelling which was pronounced by the physicians to be an ovarian tumor, but which disappeared on the administration of ether, and was discovered to be merely the result of hysteria."

In this connection we must note that people's imaginations are easily heated and often run away with their reason. They magnify their troubles, they leave out many important facts which would go to show that their cures were not so wonderful after all, they give extravagant colorings to the benefits they have received.

Again, there are a great many cases in which the cures were imaginary altogether, the patient feeling some relief for a time, his latent powers stimulated by the influence brought to bear upon him — then relapsing into his old condition, sinking back into greater weakness, perhaps dying. Yet because he felt better at the moment or for a time, his case is scheduled as a cure.

Many examples might be adduced to show how the vaunted cures of faith-healers and Christian Scientists must be greatly discounted when carefully and reasonably examined.

Nevertheless, it is admitted that in some cases cures have been effected. What these cures are, and how they must be judged we shall show shortly.

Before proceeding further we must note that many others have cures to record just as wonderful as faith-healers and Christian Scientists.

All sorts of sorcerers, even those of the most degraded pagans, have effected cures. Even in our day and time children are measured — and, they recover; warts have been charmed away, many kinds of ailments have been removed.

"The career of Prince Hohenlohe, Roman Catholic Bishop of Sardica, is as well authenticated as any fact in history." By his prayers he wrought a number of cures which expert investigations have admitted as such. — "Father Matthew was very successful in relieving the sick; after his death multitudes visited his tomb, and of these

*Faith-healing, Christian Science, and Kindred Phenomena, Buckley, p. 7,

many were helped and left their crutches there." — Knock Chapel in Ireland; Lourdes in France; churches, chapels, shrines in all parts of Roman Catholic countries, have had more or less fame. I have visited St. Roch's in New Orleans, La., and found the casts of limbs, votive tablets, and grateful gifts as evidence of healing received. There is no doubt that cures were effected in many of these places.

Turning to Protestantism "Dorothea Trudel, a woman living at Manheim, long had an establishment there. Marvellous tales have been told of the cures, some of which have been thoroughly authenticated."

"Another name widely known is that of the late Rev. W. E. Boardman, with whom I (J. M. Buckley, LL. D.) was acquainted for many years. He had an establishment in the north of London which is designated 'Bethlehem', and has created quite a sensation. There hundreds of remarkable cures are claimed of cancer, paralysis, advanced consumption, chronic rheumatism, and lameness; and the usual trophies in the shape of canes, crutches, etc., are left behind. They will not allow the place to be called a hospital, but the 'Nursery of Faith.' Their usual mode is to anoint the sufferer with oil and then pray; though considerable variety in method is practiced apparently to stimulate faith."

The same may be said of many others. "Dr. Charles Cullis, of Boston, recently deceased, was long noted in connection with healing diseases by faith and prayer, and among his followers has given Old Orchard, Maine, a reputation as great as the grotto at Lourdes has among Catholics."

We simply refer to Rev. Simpson in New York; Mrs. Mix, a colored woman in Connecticut; Geo. O. Barnes in Kentucky; Dr. Newton, and Dr. Bryant. We may add that the Mormons have also wrought cures by their prayers.

Why do we put all these in the same category with faithcurists and Christian Scientists? For several grave reasons.

First, the cures which they produce are all in the same general line. They proceed differently, the faithcurist demands faith and uses prayer; the Christian Scientist asks for neither, but simply denies and makes his patient deny the reality of all disease; the Romanist calls upon his saint,

sacred relics, and the like; the one lays on hands, the other uses different manipulations. But when we look at what they do there is a marked resemblance in results. None of them cures every ailment, all of them cure only some. None of them raise the dead, heal persons born blind or deaf when the cause is in the absence of the necessary organs, restore a limb that has been cut off, or an eye that has been lost. None of them can do anything for dementia or remove idiocy. Besides these cases there are hundreds of cases where their best efforts have proved utterly abortive. Many have believed, trusted, prayed, done all that was told them, and have died in spite of it. This is the case among all the healers we have named above. Again, many have fondly supposed themselves improving, or cured altogether, when their disease was in reality proceeding with unabated vigor, and suddenly they found themselves on the brink of death. But all cases of this kind, as well as all total failures are not published by the healers concerned.

Enough has been said to show that faith-healing and Christian Science must be ranked with sorcery, Roman shrines, divine healers, and others of similar character.

b) Faithcure and Christian Science differ totally from the miracles of Christ and of the apostles.

Faith-healers and Christian Scientists make a profession of healing, setting themselves up as rivals of regular physicians. This Christ and His apostles never did. Their business was not to gain a livelihood by curing people of diseases.

The miracles of Christ and His apostles were true miracles, patent to the eyes of man as such. We have only to glance at the raising of Lazarus and of Tabæa, the feeding of the multitude, the healing of leprosy, the curing of the man lame from his birth, and in fact at all the miracles recorded in the New Testament. As true miracles they were signs, wrought in proof that they who performed the miracles were sent of God. The works of faithcurists are no true miracles, nor are they wrought as signs to confirm some messenger of God and draw attention to his message as of God. The very things which Christ and His apostles did faithcurists and Christian Scientists cannot do. Their claims to any of the promises of Christ for miraculous

power are false, for they fail to receive the Gospel of Christ as the apostles received it.

The works of Christ and of His apostles show a marked supremacy over those of their opponents. Jesus cast out evil spirits everywhere. St. Paul smote Elymas with blindness (Acts 13, 11), and cast out the spirit of divination from a soothsaying damsel who followed after him (Acts 16, 18). The works of faith-healers and Christian Scientists show no supremacy over any of their opponents or rivals; on the contrary, they show a marked likeness to these works.

The works of Christ and of His disciples after receiving His commission show never a single failure or imperfect result. The dead arose forthwith, the sick were cured without a doubt, there was never only a half-cure, or mere improvement, there was no sham cure and fatal relapse.

Faithcurists especially like to claim kinship with the apostles and their great miraculous gifts of healing, but the considerations adduced are enough to dispel this delusion completely.

c) All the marvels of faithcure and of Christian Science, like those of their rivals on all sides, admit of a perfectly natural and sufficient explanation.

The mystery lies in the influence which the mind has upon the body. This influence becomes exceedingly powerful when aroused by strong expectation, by a feeling of unshaken certainty, and by concentration upon certain affected parts. How this influence operates and to what extent its power may go, is difficult to say. Faithcure and Christian Science certainly have no monopoly of its workings. But when they use this natural influence and pretend to effect their results in some miraculous way they show their dense ignorance or great falseness.

Dr. Durand of New Orleans, according to the *Pica-yune* of that city, recently made a test of mental influence by giving a hundred patients a dose of sweetened water. Fifteen minutes after, entering apparently in great excitement, he announced that he had by mistake given a powerful emetic, and preparations must be made accordingly. Eighty out of the hundred patients fell to vomiting.

An officer of the Government (in India) was compelled to send native messengers out into a district infected with cholera. As he sent them out they took the disease and

died; and it came to such a pass among Government peons under his charge that a man thought himself doomed when selected for that duty. A German doctor in that region had put forth the theory that inoculation with a preparation of quassia was a specific for cholera — a simon-pure humbug. But this gentleman seized the idea; he cut the skin of the messenger's arm with a lancet so as to draw some blood, and then rubbed in the quassia, telling them what the doctor had said about it. Not a man thus treated died. (Rev. J. S. Humphrey, for many years a missionary in India.)

Here is a simple instance. Sir Humphry Davy was called to see a patient afflicted with paralysis. In making his diagnosis he placed a thermometer under the patient's tongue simply to take his temperature. The patient at once claimed he felt relief. Quick to seize the thought the doctor simply continued for two weeks to put that thermometer under the patient's tongue. In this case the imagination was not assisted by applications to the affected part.

Interesting instances might be multiplied to fill a volume. All good physicians know something of this influence of mind over body, and make more or less use of it. This is generally a legitimate procedure.

All the real power for healing that comes into play in faithcure and Christian Science is this stimulated power of mind over body. Where this cannot be aroused, or where when aroused it meets a trouble too great to overcome, faithcure and all similar cures fail utterly.

Diseases may be classified. Some are known as functional, viz.: attacks of fits, hysteria, some forms of paralysis. Strong mental impressions often relieve these. There is nothing wonderful in Christian Science or faith-healing exerting an influence over such cases. It has been the general experience that such cases usually relapse or assume some new form. There is another group of diseases that run a certain course, and may end in recovery or in the death of the sufferer. Such cases are typhoid fever, inflammation of the lungs, small-pox, scarlet fever, most eruptions of the skin, many injuries, and so on. Without the slightest treatment some of these cases would recover. When the Christian Scientist sees such cases from day to

day no claim can be advanced of having worked a cure. All physicians know that judicious treatment aids nature in these cases, and lessens the suffering, the duration of the illness, the mortality, and secures better results. Now coming to the last class of diseases, or those with some organic or incurable change in the affected organ of the body we meet with conditions that can only be relieved. Here the Christian Scientist fails completely. There is not on record a single well-attested case of a true, usually incurable organic disease removed by this treatment. (Public Opinion, January 2, '96.)

About ninety-five per cent. of all cures effected by faith-healers are among women. (Frederick A. Fernald in *Popular Science Monthly*.) Nervous troubles prevail among women, and among the diseases from which they suffer there are not many in which the nerves play no part. This sufficiently shows that the influence exerted upon the mind by faithcure or Christian Science will be likely to affect patients of this kind to a considerable degree.

In addition to all that has been stated we must remember that of about twenty-nine persons taken sick twenty-eight will get well anyhow. (Dr. W. S. Strode in *West. Med. Rep.*) The tendency of the body is always to battle and overcome disease. Physicians freely admit the fact, and that their efforts are only to assist nature.

There is no reason to find anything miraculous in the works of faith-healing or Christian science. All they accomplish and all they fail to accomplish is sufficiently explained by the natural influence of mind over body. All miraculous claims are based on mere assertions.

II.

Both Faithcure and Christian Science flagrantly contradict the Word of God in their philosophy and practice.

a) The way in which Faithcure and Christian Science consider and handle disease is contrary to God's Word.

The adepts of faithcure look upon disease as something subject to "faith," namely to what they call faith. This faith simply appears to be a conviction that what they want shall and will take place. This is not the faith of which the Scrip-

tures speak, it is not Christian faith. It is a man-made thing, and when mistaken for Christian faith a terrible delusion. Disease is not subject to this man-made faith of faithcurists any more than to strong mental impressions generally. Christianity has nothing to do with it, for pagans may have this faith. Disease is not subject even to Christian faith, so that when a faithful Christian prays to be healed, healing will certainly take place. St. Paul had faith, and prayed in faith to be healed of a thorn in the flesh, yet God answered him by allowing the affliction to remain, declaring: "My grace is sufficient for thee." 2 Cor. 12, 7-9. The great function of Christian faith is not to shake off disease, but to trust in Christ, to embrace forgiveness and salvation, and to submit to His will, which is often that we shall be sick and suffer. The plea of faithcurists, when they fail, that the patient had not faith, is an empty excuse to explain away failure. Some have the "faith" of the faithcurists, and yet remain sick and die; others get well without it.

Christian Science looks upon all disease as without reality, making it a mere thing of the imagination. This is false. Mrs. Eddy, the founder of this delusion, claims, "That erring mortal views, misnamed mind, produce all the organic and animal actions of the body." . . . "Rightly understood, instead of possessing sentient matter, we have sensationless bodies." She declares: "Matter cannot suffer." The disease and suffering are wholly in the mind. The moment, therefore, the mind is rid of the thought of disease and suffering, both are gone. They have no reality in the body. The entire Scriptures flatly contradict these notions; reason does the same. Christ healed real diseases. The procedure of Christian scientists accords with their theory. They seek to persuade people that they are not sick. The Scriptures teach a different course; Christ healed in a different way. The false notion of Christian Science regarding the reality of disease is connected with a lot of other notions equally false and contrary to Scripture, especially also with the idea, that sin is not real, but also an imagination, like disease.

"A point of difference between Faith Healers and Mind Curers" (or Christian scientists) "is worthy of observation. Faith Healers require the patient to have faith; Mind Curers

make a boast of the fact that faith is not necessary. A close analysis, however, shows this boast is vain. Before they are sent for there is usually some faith, and often much, combined with a distrust of other systems. This was, as some of their authorities affirm, the case when they began. Sufficient time has elapsed to develop a constituency who employ no other methods. If there is no faith, there must be a distrust of other forms of practise, or there would be no reason for turning to the new. Where there is no faith on the part of the patient, usually his friends believe, and have induced him to make the experiment. Thus he is surrounded by an atmosphere of faith which is so important that all writers attach great weight to it." Christian scientists themselves say that when the friends of the patient are not favorably inclined "their absence is more helpful than their presence, and it is desirable to be alone with the patient while treating him."

"Assuming that the healer has arrived, it is easy to see how faith is engendered. She takes her seat, and after a few unimportant questions becomes silent. The thoughts that wander through the mind of the invalid, as told me by a patient of thorough intelligence, an alumnus of one of the first universities of this country, were such as these: 'Can there be anything in this? I don't believe there is, and yet a great many people are believing in it, and some most wonderful cures have taken place. There is Mrs. ——. I know that she was given up to die by our best physicians, and I know that she is well.' Then the eye is turned to the metaphysician, who seems looking at far-off things and wrestling with some problems not yet solved, but of the certainty of the solution of which she has no doubt. Sometimes the practitioners cover their eyes, and this would add to the effect in many temperaments. The fifteen minutes pass and leave the unbeliever passive; as a quotation elsewhere describes it, 'less cantankerous.'"

The healer leaves with a few encouraging words. No medicines need be bothered about. What the appetite calls for may be eaten without anxiety. "The effect of the treatment having been pleasant, the patient rather longs than otherwise for the next day to come, and for the next." No surgeon's knife, if the case be of such kind, frightens the

mind. "The invalid discovers that he does not die, that he sleeps a little better; certainly he is not aroused to take medicine, and there is no fear that he will take cold; he feels decidedly better at the next visit, and now faith is not only born but turned into sight. His friends assure him that he is better, and he tells them that he is so.—Perhaps the most potent cause in awakening faith is the sublime audacity displayed by the practitioner who dares to dispense with drugs, manipulations, hygiene, prayer, and religious ceremony. That spectacle would infallibly produce either such opposition and contempt as would result in the termination of the experiment, or faith. It is impossible to be in a negative position in its presence, where the responsibilities of life and death are assumed." (Buckley.)

Christian Science, therefore, is essentially like faithcure. The way is different, the thing is the same. But the way and the thing are contrary to God's Word and truth.

b) The way in which medicine is treated by faithcure and Christian Science is contrary to the Scriptures.

Both discard medicine, and Christian Science especially claims that drugs are without healing or even hurting effect. Mrs. Eddy says: "Christian Science divests material drugs of their imaginary power. . . . The uselessness of drugs, the emptiness of knowledge, the nothingness of matter and its imaginary laws, are apparent as we rise from the rubbish of belief to the acquisition and demonstration of spiritual understanding. When the sick recover by the use of drugs, it is the law of a general belief, culminating in individual faith that heals, and according to this faith will the effect be." The folly of this talk is apparent at a glance when we recall the effect of poisons; they kill even when taken in ignorance, even when taken by animals. Ecclesiasticus writes: "The Lord hath created medicines out of the earth; and he that is wise will not abhor them. My son, in thy sickness be not negligent; but pray unto the Lord, and He will make thee whole. Leave off from sin, and order thy hands aright, and cleanse thy heart from all wickedness. Then give place to the physician, for the Lord hath created him; let him not go from thee, for thou hast need of him. There is a time when in their hands there is good success. For they shall also pray unto the Lord, that He would prosper that which

they give for ease and to prolong life." St. Luke was a physician, and that the Scriptures call him such is sufficient evidence that he continued the practice of medicine, and that this practice accorded with Christian faith. Timothy is urged by St. Paul to take a little wine for his stomach's sake. People, certainly, expect too much of medicine in many cases, and ascribe too much to the skill of doctors. But the abuse does not discount the use. To refuse all medicines must certainly be classed among "the vagaries on the borderland of insanity."

c) Faithcure and Christian Science are contrary to Scripture in regard to prayer.

Faithcure expects of prayer what the Scriptures nowhere promise. We must all die, and by far the greatest majority die of diseases. God has so ordained that when our time comes we shall die, and that in multitudes of cases disease shall bring on death. When the Christian prays, he never expects that without fail he will be healed, and that at once in a miraculous way. Christian prayer always ends: "Thy will, not mine, be done," and places the person praying completely into God's hands. Christian prayer finds itself answered even when disease continues and ends in death. Moreover, Christian prayer is always in Christ's name, i. e. full of faith in His meritorious work; which is not always the case with faithcurists. They abuse prayer and often blaspheme God.

In this connection we must add that faithcurists often boast that God answers their prayers by revealing unto them that their patients shall recover. Suffice it to say that this is simply pernicious imagination, or worse still, utter falsehood. Frequent havoc has been caused by telling sick persons that God revealed to the faithcurist the sickness would disappear, when it simply remained and perhaps ended fatally.

Christian Science rejects prayers altogether. One of its votaries writes: "Prayer to a personal God affects the sick like a drug that has no efficacy of its own, but borrows its power from human faith and belief. The drug does nothing because it has no intelligence." This should be enough for Christians who are bidden to pray without ceasing.

There are still other ways in which faithcure and Christian Science contradict the sure Word of God. The above will suffice for those whose hope and trust is built on this Word alone.

III.

Both Faithcure and Christian Science work great injury to the body and especially to the soul.

a) Both delusions work much harm to men's bodies.

This is always the case when they fail to cure. When expectations are raised so high and then suddenly come to naught, the opposite effect to the one intended results. Sick persons experience a revulsion of feeling which plunges them into great depression and frequently into despair. As the mind may influence the body for healing, so it may also influence the body for harm. It is a dangerous thing to tamper with faithcure and Christian Science. Weak and unstable minds are the very ones most inclined to make the trial, and they are the very ones which will suffer most. Nervous women are easily wrought up to believe in these follies, and they are most easily hurt beyond recovery.

Even when cures result in some ailments and faith is established in faithcure or Christian Science, and all seems well, the very next case of disease may bring on the reaction, shipwreck of this false "faith" and its attendant devastation.

Moreover, while faithcure or Christian Science is being tried, medicine, hygiene and careful nursing are neglected, and thus often enough death or permanent injuries result, so that the State has frequently been compelled to prosecute persons on account of criminal negligence.

b) The soul, however, suffers especially from the follies of faithcure and Christian Science.

Their false notions regarding disease (and sin), medicine, and prayer are exceedingly pernicious. This is so clear from what has been said above that we need not elaborate the point.

"It may be asked, what harm can result from allowing persons to believe in 'faith-healing?' Very great indeed. Its tendency is to produce an effeminate type of character which shrinks from pain and concentrates attention upon self and its sensations. It sets up false grounds for deter-

mining whether a person is or is not in favor with God. It opens the door to every superstition, such as attaching importance to dreams; signs; opening the Bible at random, expecting the Lord so to influence their thoughts and minds that they can gather His will from the first passage they see; 'impressions,' 'assurances,' etc. Practically it gives support to other delusions which claim a supernatural element. It seriously diminishes the influence of Christianity by subjecting it to a test which it cannot endure. It diverts attention from the moral and spiritual transformation which Christianity professes to work, a transformation which, wherever made, manifests its divinity, so that none who behold it need any other proof that it is of God. It destroys the ascendancy of reason; and thus, like similar delusions, it is self-perpetuating; and its natural and, in some minds irresistible tendency is to mental derangement." (Buckley.)

Christian Science has been promulgated in books presenting a full philosophy. These books are one mass of error, contradicting the Word of God on every page. To accept any part of them is to drink in so much error and falsehood, so much soul-poison.

The fact that so many are led astray, need not trouble us. The world is full of fools. When people who are accounted intelligent and pious become entangled, we must remember that the best are liable to fall, and that much intelligence is hollow, a show of knowledge without sure foundation, and much piety lacks true stability in real Christian character.

CHRISTIAN SYMBOLS IN THE CATACOMBS.

BY REV. J. C. SCHACHT, MARION, IND.

The study of the ancient Catacombs is interesting from different points of view. These subterranean galleries, containing, it is said, no less than six millions of tombs, furnish us data of the varying life and thought, of the joys and sorrows, of the trials and triumphs of those who fought and fell in the earliest battle of the Church against the world. "In traversing these tangled labyrinths," says Dr. Withrow, "we

are brought face to face with the primitive ages; we are present at the worship of the infant Church; we observe its rites; we study its institutions; we witness the deep emotions of the first believers as they commit their dead, often their martyred dead, to their last, long resting place; we decipher the touching record of their sorrow, of the holy hopes by which they were sustained, of 'their faith triumphant o'er their fears,' and of their assurance of the resurrection of the dead."

There we find the mortal remains of many who heard the solemn words of the Lord's disciples, peacefully awaiting the trumpet of the resurrection, when in their flesh they shall see God, and shall enter into a full fruition of their hopes to the glory of Christ in whose service they suffered and died. On that day those crumbling sepulchres, regarded now merely as interesting relics of antiquity, shall bloom as the garden of the Lord, for in them has been planted the choicest seed of the Church.

Several theories of the origin of these subterranean burial places have been advanced. Some have affirmed that they originated among the pagan Romans; others claim that they were excavated by the old Etrurians as far back as the twelfth century before our era. But be that as it may, we know that nearly all the civilized and uncivilized nations of antiquity, practiced interment of their dead, and that also the Romans gradually adopted this custom in preference to cremation. The question of the origin of the Catacombs, is one of little moment, and we pass it by here without further notice. Our attention in the present article shall be occupied with the symbols which cover their walls, and which, after the lapse of many centuries, still furnish us some knowledge of the character of the slumbering occupants of these tombs.

Before speaking of the symbols separately, however, we cannot refrain from remarking that among the emblems of the first centuries there are none that represent sorrow and suffering. Every symbol is a reflection of joy and peace, of gentleness and love. The Christians who passed through the fiery trials of the first centuries, counted their suffering as nothing compared to the joys that awaited them; they were so absorbed in the promises of life, that they felt not

the pangs of death. Their only aim in life, and the ardent desire of their souls, was to be at home with Christ. "To look at the Catacombs alone," says Rochette, "it might be supposed that persecution had no victims, since Christianity has made no allusion to suffering." And another says: "There is no sign of mourning, no token of resentment, no expression of vengeance; all breathes of gentleness, benevolence, and love."

It has been asserted by some writers that the cross is one of the earliest symbols in the Catacombs. And remembering that the cross was one of the most sacred emblems of the early Christians, and that it was extensively used among them, we might suppose the statement to be correct. Tertullian, for example, says: "At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on seat, in all the ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign of the cross." From these words it is evident that the cross played a very important role in the private and public devotions of the Christians from the earliest days of the Church. And if we had no direct evidence to the contrary, there might be some ground to believe that they already bestowed upon it the idolatrous reverence, which was associated with its use in the subsequent ages. But we are told, and certainly inclined to believe, that "they used it as a token of recognition, as a sign of fellowship, as a reminder of the duty of self-denial, as a symbol of consolation in the days of persecution, as an encouragement to self-control, to self-dedication at all times." The abuse of this sacred symbol crept into the Church when men laid claim to divine prerogatives and authority.

But our best authorities declare that the cross, the reproach of which the Christians were ever ready to bear, is not found among the inscriptions of the first two centuries. For its absence Dr. Withrow assigns two reasons, which are probably correct. He says:

"The very sanctity of the symbol, and the detestation in which it was held by the heathen, conspired to prevent the early Christians from exposing it to their profane gaze."

By this, however, we are not to understand that there

are brought face to face with the primitive ages; we are present at the worship of the infant Church; we observe its rites; we study its institutions; we witness the deep emotions of the first believers as they commit their dead, often their martyred dead, to their last, long resting place; we decipher the touching record of their sorrow, of the holy hopes by which they were sustained, of 'their faith triumphant o'er their fears,' and of their assurance of the resurrection of the dead."

There we find the mortal remains of many who heard the solemn words of the Lord's disciples, peacefully awaiting the trumpet of the resurrection, when in their flesh they shall see God, and shall enter into a full fruition of their hopes to the glory of Christ in whose service they suffered and died. On that day those crumbling sepulchres, regarded now merely as interesting relics of antiquity, shall bloom as the garden of the Lord, for in them has been planted the choicest seed of the Church.

Several theories of the origin of these subterranean burial places have been advanced. Some have affirmed that they originated among the pagan Romans; others claim that they were excavated by the old Etrurians as far back as the twelfth century before our era. But be that as it may, we know that nearly all the civilized and uncivilized nations of antiquity, practiced interment of their dead, and that also the Romans gradually adopted this custom in preference to cremation. The question of the origin of the Catacombs, is one of little moment, and we pass it by here without further notice. Our attention in the present article shall be occupied with the symbols which cover their walls, and which, after the lapse of many centuries, still furnish us some knowledge of the character of the slumbering occupants of these tombs.

Before speaking of the symbols separately, however, we cannot refrain from remarking that among the emblems of the first centuries there are none that represent sorrow and suffering. Every symbol is a reflection of joy and peace, of gentleness and love. The Christians who passed through the fiery trials of the first centuries, counted their suffering as nothing compared to the joys that awaited them; they were so absorbed in the promises of life, that they felt not

the pangs of death. Their only aim in life, and the ardent desire of their souls, was to be at home with Christ. "To look at the Catacombs alone," says Rochette, "it might be supposed that persecution had no victims, since Christianity has made no allusion to suffering." And another says: "There is no sign of mourning, no token of resentment, no expression of vengeance; all breathes of gentleness, benevolence, and love."

It has been asserted by some writers that the cross is one of the earliest symbols in the Catacombs. And remembering that the cross was one of the most sacred emblems of the early Christians, and that it was extensively used among them, we might suppose the statement to be correct. Tertullian, for example, says: "At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on seat, in all the ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign of the cross." From these words it is evident that the cross played a very important role in the private and public devotions of the Christians from the earliest days of the Church. And if we had no direct evidence to the contrary, there might be some ground to believe that they already bestowed upon it the idolatrous reverence, which was associated with its use in the subsequent ages. But we are told, and certainly inclined to believe, that "they used it as a token of recognition, as a sign of fellowship, as a reminder of the duty of self-denial, as a symbol of consolation in the days of persecution, as an encouragement to self-control, to self-dedication at all times." The abuse of this sacred symbol crept into the Church when men laid claim to divine prerogatives and authority.

But our best authorities declare that the cross, the reproach of which the Christians were ever ready to bear, is not found among the inscriptions of the first two centuries. For its absence Dr. Withrow assigns two reasons, which are probably correct. He says:

"The very sanctity of the symbol, and the detestation in which it was held by the heathen, conspired to prevent the early Christians from exposing it to their profane gaze."

By this, however, we are not to understand that there

was no reference to the cross at all. When the Christians used it as an emblem on the tombs of their beloved dead, they merely veiled it from the gaze of the unbelievers by other symbols, usually by the monogram of Christ.

One of the oldest and most appropriate symbols is that of the lamb. It has the sanction of Holy Scriptures both as a designation for Christ and the Christians. Jesus Himself being frequently spoken of as a lamb in the Scriptures, this symbol found special favor in the ancient Church, inasmuch as it beautifully represented the meekness, purity, and patience of the Lord, who was brought as a lamb to the slaughter and yet opened not His mouth. "Christ," says Lactantius, "was the white lamb without spot; that is, He was innocent, and just, and holy, who, being slain by the . . . Jews, is the salvation of all who have written on their foreheads the sign of blood—that is, of the cross, on which He shed His blood." And a more beautiful and suggestive symbol than the lamb could scarcely be found, by which to represent those, who have found peace in life and joy in death through the blood of the Lamb of God; and who enjoy the Shepherd-care of Him who laid upon His disciples the duty of feeding His sheep and His lambs. Christ is, indeed, the Good Shepherd who seeks the erring lamb until He finds it, and, taking it up in His arms, carries it into the green pasture provided by His love. It is this Bible imagery, which presented the calm, sweet pastoral scenes, that the first Christians loved to meditate upon during the days of fiery persecution. Here they obtained glimpses of a future, which made them able and willing to endure brief seasons of unrest and pain. But like many other things in the Church, this beautiful emblem was put to such idolatrous uses later on, that in 692, at the Council of Constantinople, held in the imperial palace, Trullan, a decree forbidding its further use was adopted by the Bishop of the Eastern Church.

The symbol which occurs most frequently upon the walls of the Catacombs is the monogram of Christ. This is composed of the Greek letters Chi (X) and Rho (P), the latter bisecting the former perpendicularly. The Chi, being the first letter of the name of Christ, and at the same time forming what is known as St. Andrew's cross, is a mystic portrait both of the person and work of Jesus. "To the

first members of the Church," says Farrar, "it represented their Master, who was all in all to them; and in that point of view, which is a wider and a happier one than any of later days, it represented the whole faith,—the person of Christ, His death for man, and the life and death of man in Christ."

One interesting circumstance connected with this symbol may be mentioned here, namely, that from the time of the miraculous vision of Constantine before the battle of the Milvian Bridge, this emblem was inscribed upon all the banners of the soldiers. Lactantius says: "Constantine was directed in a dream to cause the heavenly sign to be delineated on the shields of his soldiers, and so to proceed to battle." Then there are other symbols often found associated with the monogram, namely, the wreath, palm branch, doves, and the Alpha and Omega. Thus by grouping the symbols, a reference was made to the various portions of Holy Scriptures, from which the Christians derived a special comfort. The Alpha and Omega evidently refer to Rev. i, 8: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord." And the doves recall the admonition of our Lord: "Be ye harmless as doves." The dove being an emblem of peace, it refers to Christ and His followers, and sometimes to the souls of the departed, who have overcome the world and are at rest in heaven.

The oldest and perhaps the most interesting symbol in the Catacombs is the fish. At first sight it puzzles one to discover its relation to Christianity, but a moment's reflection brings out the fact that no other would have served the Christians so well at that time. They simply resorted to the means which Jesus Himself employed when He spake to the unbelieving multitude in parables, that seeing they might not see. "It is a striking illustration of that disciplina arcana of the primitive Church which employed signs whose secret meaning its heathen foes could not understand." And it was, no doubt, the Lord's own words in which He refers to His disciples as fishers of men, and likens the Gospel to a drag-net, cast into the sea of humanity, that suggested the fish as a fitting symbol of those who have been regenerated through the baptismal water. The earliest reference to this in the writings of the Church Fathers, we find in the hymn

of Clement of Alexandria at the close of *The Instructor*. In that hymn Jesus is spoken of as—

“Fisher of men, the Blest,
Out of the world’s unrest,
Out of sin’s troubled sea,
Taking us, Lord, to Thee.

* * * * *

With choicest fish good store
Drawing the net to shore.”

And Tertullian in his treatise on baptism, says: “But we little fishes, after the example of our *ΙΧΘΥΣ* Jesus Christ, are born in water, nor have we safety in any other way than by permanently abiding in water; so that most monstrous creature, who had no right to teach even sound doctrine, knew full well how to kill the little fishes, by taking them away from the water.”

Then it must be noted also that the Greek letters composing the word *ichthus*, fish, furnish the initial characters of the sentence Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior. Here we evidently have a reference to our Savior, who “is a fish prepared in His passion, by whose interior remedies we are daily enlightened and fed.”

St. Augustine says: ‘*ΙΧΘΥΣ* is the mystical name of Christ, because He descended into the depths of this mortal life as into the abyss of waters.’ Here, then, also, we have a double reference, namely, on the one hand to Him from whom all gifts and blessings flow, and on the other to those who are blessed by the Lord’s grace and mercy.

Also the ship and the anchor are frequently found in the Catacombs. The latter is a reference to the words of Paul in Hebrews 6, 19: “Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail.” Just as the anchor holds the ship upon the sea, so the Word of God as an anchor holds the soul steadfast and sure. “It assured the storm-tossed voyager on life’s rough sea that, while the anchor of his hope was cast ‘within the veil,’ his life-bark would outride the fiercest blasts and wildest waves of persecution, and at last glide safely into the haven of everlasting rest.”

DOCUMENTS IN THE PENTATEUCH.

BY REV. G. FINKE, CAMERON, IDAHO.

When we maintain that the Pentateuch is a complete whole with one theme and written according to one definite plan, and therefore must be the work of one author, we do not say anything about the sources from which this author may have drawn. This is quite another question, which does not touch the oneness or unity of the Pentateuch. We will try now to ascertain from which sources the author of the Pentateuch may have drawn.

The Book of Genesis contains the history of the ante-Mosaic time. Between the death of Joseph, which is recorded in the last chapter of Genesis, and the birth of Moses there is a space of 280 years. Therefore we conclude that Moses drew the history of the beginnings of mankind and of Israel either from oral or from written sources. That Moses drew from oral tradition cannot be demonstrated. This certainly does not say that he did not do so in some cases. But in favor of the use of written sources or documents we urge the language as well as the contents of some sections.

Although the language of Genesis as a rule is that of the Mosaic period like that of the other books of the Pentateuch, we find in Genesis many words and expressions which were no more in common use in the time of Moses. The latter we conclude from the fact that these words are not used in the last four books of the Pentateuch and are partly supplied by other words. If Moses had in those sections in which such antiquated words are contained, drawn from oral tradition, he certainly would not have used words which were already obsolete in his time. The use of such antiquated words in some sections can be explained only by assuming that Moses drew in such sections from old documents which were in his reach. In the record of the battle of Abraham against Chedorlaomer, for instance, we read that Abraham marched out his "trained" (servants) i. e. those who were trained in the use of arms (14, 14); Melchizedek speaks of "the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth" (v. 19), which expressions we do not find again

in the entire Old Testament. Other words which are characteristic of the language of Genesis are collected by Keil, Einl. § 14, 1.

That Moses made use of old documents in writing his first book is also evident from certain peculiarities in the language of the two genealogies, ch. 5 and 11, 10-32. They are remarkable for their antique style. The latter shows itself in the constant use of the formula "lived" and "begat," and in the fact that these two genealogies constantly use "beget," while other genealogies use also "son" to express the same thought. This peculiarity cannot be explained but by the assumption that Moses copied the two genealogies from old documents. That he cannot have taken them both from one document, appears from the fact that both differ constantly in one thing. While we find in the first (ch. 5) constantly given the sum of all the years which each of the forefathers lived, we miss this entirely in the second. The list of the generations of Esau (ch. 36) must also have been taken from a written source, for only by this assumption the difference in the names of Esau's wives can be explained. For Mahalath the daughter of Ishmael (28, 9) is called Bashemath in 36, 3, and Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite (26, 34) is called Aholibamah in 36, 3. From these three examples we conclude that Moses drew not only these three but all genealogies of Genesis from written sources, especially the precious genealogy of Noah and his sons (ch. 10) and the genealogy 4, 17-24.

That Moses made use of documents in writing Genesis appears also from the precision with which certain events are recorded, which precision would hardly be explainable if Moses had drawn from oral tradition only. We mention here for instance the record of the purchase of Machpelah where Sarah was buried (ch. 23); the abode of Isaac in Gerar (ch. 26); Joseph's institutions in Egypt (47, 13-26); the blessing of Israel (ch. 49), etc.

From all this appears that it is probable in the highest degree that Moses made use of ancient documents in writing Genesis. But there is no possibility of singling out these documents and giving a definite description of them. The impossibility of this will appear when we consider that as a rule Moses did not simply copy these documents or parts

of them (he may have done this with the genealogies), but worked them together in his first book and blended them together with those facts which he probably drew from oral tradition. We have shown already that Moses follows out a leading idea in the Genesis and disposes of his material upon a definite plan.

Furthermore it is probable that Moses inserted documents also into the middle books of the Pentateuch. These were official documents of historical but especially of legal contents. These documents contained such things which were written down directly after their promulgation either by Moses himself or according to his order by the priests. The latter assumption does not contradict the claim of the Pentateuch for its Mosaic authorship. For St. Paul also dictated most of his epistles to others, from which fact no reasonable man ever has tried to make an argument against the authenticity of the epistles. Among the sections which Moses must have written separately already in the wilderness to insert them afterwards into his book, we count for instance the defeat of Amalek (Ex. 17, 8-15); the list of the resting places of Israel in the wilderness (Numb. 33); the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20-23). Further we mention here the Lord's ordinance concerning the erection of the tabernacle (Ex. 24-30), for the workmen must necessarily have had written prescriptions, otherwise they never could have built it according to the Lord's instructions. The laws concerning the sacrifices (Lev. 1-7), which actually appear in a certain sense as a complete whole, must have been written directly after their promulgation, if the priests should be able to obey them precisely.

These and other sections Moses inserted into his work which he rendered complete by adding his Deuteronomic address. This opinion of the origin of the Pentateuch does not contradict the unity of the latter. For by maintaining the unity of the Pentateuch we do not affirm that the latter was begun and finished by Moses at one short time at the end of his life in the plains of Moab. To do this the time would probably have been too short.

THE MINISTER'S READING.

BY REV. PROFESSOR A. PFLUEGER, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

Ministers of the Gospel are sent forth as sheep in the midst of wolves, and are therefore to be wise as serpents and harmless as doves. They are shepherds under the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls and are to feed the Church of God which He has purchased with His own blood. They are ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God, and as they will have to give an account of their stewardship on the last great day before the Judge of all the earth, it is required of them that they be found faithful. They are to be examples of the believers and to the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. They are ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary of the King of kings and Lord of lords, to declare to the world the will of the Lord God Omnipotent and to beseech men in His name to be reconciled unto God and to flee from the wrath to come. They are thus entrusted with an office of exceeding importance and clothed with a responsibility of the most solemn character.

Well may they exclaim therefore with the apostle: "Who is sufficient for these things?" He answers his own question when he says: "Such trust have we through Christ to God-ward: not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament." Such trust all ministers must have through Christ toward God. They have no sufficiency of themselves; their sufficiency must be of God who alone can and does make them able ministers of the ministry of reconciliation. This sufficiency He gives through the grace of His Word and the Word of His grace. But that Word is not to be laid aside to be covered with dust: it must be read and studied and searched.

In the famous declaration of Luther as to what makes a theologian—a true man of God—meditation deservedly occupies the central position. By meditation the Reformer meant what we mean by reading and study. "Give attendance to reading," said the apostle to Timothy. "Eat the

book," said the angel to the seer of the Apocalypse. "Search the Scriptures," said the Savior to the Jews and to all who would be His disciples.

I. First in importance to the mind of the minister is the question, "What am I to read?" It is certain that he cannot and may not read everything. To what books must he restrict himself and what book should he read first? First of all and most of all he should read his Bible. That is the case that contains the pearl of great price; that is the shrine in which is stored the bread that came down from heaven; that is the fountain from which flows in crystal streams the water of life, of which if a man drink he shall never die. To it no other book is worthy to be compared. Without the knowledge which it imparts we should be without God and without hope in the world; we should be and remain in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity.

But this does not mean that the minister is to read no other book than the Bible. He needs must read much else in order that he may properly understand the Bible and its doctrines. The works of the great men whom God has given to the Church and to the world must not be neglected or despised, but must be highly prized and appreciated and studied. Time would fail me if I were to attempt to name all the books that invite his attention. He will not find it possible or expedient to read all. He will be forced to select and pass many by; and in making his selection he should act on the principle that only the best that he can afford is good enough. He should read the confessions of the Church and the writings of such men as Luther and Chemnitz and Gerhard: he should feed upon them and grow fat on them, for the food which they furnish is every way wholesome and nutritious. They knew what they wanted to say and how to say it; and they were not afraid to give expression to their convictions for fear of offending the higher critics or of incurring their ridicule, as is too often the case with our modern writers.

Nor should the minister neglect to read the world's great orators and poets and historians. But he will do well to confine himself to the best of their kind in all departments of literature. His money is too valuable and his time too precious to be spent upon trash. Life is too short to

enable him to read everything. Many will find their means and their time all too meager to do justice even to the best. There is a kind of literature that impoverishes and deadens or kills the soul. Avoid it as you would the plague. Spend your energies, material, intellectual and moral, on the master works of the master minds of the ages. "Better, far better," it has been well said, "to be 'a man of one book,' if it is the best of its kind, than to possess and in some loose way to pass through cart-loads of the insipid trash which ever, under the name of religious literature, plays into the hands of infidelity, by reducing what is sublimest in our faith to pious twaddle, and enervating the mind, under pretense of improving the heart, of preachers and people." Learn to read and love the best, and your mind and heart will loathe the superficial and the trashy. Let whoever will gather poison and filth; be it ours to gather honey for stores for time and eternity.

II. It is not a matter left to the minister's discretion as to whether he shall read or not: he is put under obligations to read by the divine command. For God's sake he ought to read and search the Scriptures. "Search the Scriptures," says our Master; "for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of Me." "Give attendance to reading," says the holy apostle as he was moved to say by the Holy Ghost. It is therefore a sin not to read when we have the time and the means to do so.

The minister of the Gospel is under obligations to give attendance to reading for the sake of his hearers also. They are to be fed with the bread of life. Through him the heavenly manna is to come down to them. He is to give constantly, but he cannot give what he has not and he cannot have what he does not receive. He is not to be satisfied with the least possible growth on the part of his flock; he is to aim to have it fatten on the green pastures of the Word. His mission is to teach the people, but how can he teach them unless he is himself taught of God? But God will not teach him unless he read His Word. To feed the Church of God is not a matter of a day, but of days and weeks and months and years. In order that his people may grow in the knowledge of the truth and be rooted and grounded in

it, he must himself grow in knowledge and become ever more firmly established in the truth.

For his own sake also he must read and study, seeing that otherwise he cannot fully, worthily and conscientiously discharge the duties of his calling. On his own account he will need the comfort and the sustaining power and grace of the Word. The trials and discouragements which rise like grim monsters and beset his path, even when he is most faithful, make it necessary for him to go daily to the refreshing streams of the fountain of grace. Against the wiles of the devil and the fiery darts of the wicked and the fear of man that bringeth a snare there is nothing that can sustain him and enable him to do his duty manfully save the grace of God which He gives us through His Word.

It ought to be the minister's aim to be eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures, not for the sake of glorifying himself and of shining as a great pulpit orator, but that God may be glorified and souls may be saved and the mouths of the gainsayers may be stopped. But how can he become eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures without reading and study? Let him not suppose that his native ability, however great that may be, will furnish him with what he needs. God alone can touch his lips with holy fire. He alone can warm his heart with the flame of the Holy Spirit. And rest assured that He will not do it, if one presumptuously neglects or despises His commands and entreaties. He has set before us the true models of eloquence and style in the writings of the prophets and apostles and the holy men who have followed in their footsteps. In the Holy Scriptures God literally speaks to us in the eloquence of the tongues of men and of angels. Never man spake as our Master spake; and the prophets and apostles rise to an eloquence that is altogether unequalled in the realm of profane literature ancient or modern. Taking the Bible as their model and fired by its spirit, the great Christian orators and poets have surpassed the eloquence of Demosthenes and Cicero and of Homer and Vergil. To learn how to preach, read the sermons of our Lord and of His apostles and of Chrysostom and Luther. They will teach you to be eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures. Study the imagery of the Bible and of the Christian preachers and poets for the sake of illustrations

that really illustrate and that fix themselves indelibly in the mind and heart of the hearer. In that way your own discourses will be made thoroughly alive and attractive and you will be able to win your hearers for the truth as it is in Jesus.

Moreover, the minister is to read and study that he may improve and that his profiting may appear unto all. Let him bear in mind that if he is not going forward he is going backward. By depending upon his supposed genius and his so-called inner consciousness he will soon preach himself empty and at last feed his people on husks, till they refuse to let him feed them at all. When the candidate for the ministry leaves the seminary he is not at the end but at the beginning of his career as a real student. If he really knows himself as the circumstances require and has learned to appreciate at their true value the Sacred Scriptures and the oceanic proportions of the study of theology and its literature, so far from considering himself perfect he will have a profound conviction of the meagerness of his attainments and of the indispensable necessity of further study and research. He will then be fully alive to the fact that he has thus far merely learned how to study; henceforth he is to do the real studying. By so doing he will not fail to improve, and it will be evident to all that he is indeed growing and profiting, and he will need have no fears about crossing the so-called ministerial deadline. But if he cease reading and studying and thus begins to go backward, then let him beware; for the deadline is in the downward direction, not in the upward. We have passed from death unto life and we are striving after a life beyond life, eternal in the heavens. In the case of the true minister the deadline is in the rear.

One cannot keep what he has and increase it without giving attendance to reading. Nothing is so easily forgotten as the good and the useful when once we cease to exercise ourselves in them by daily practice. The graduate from our seminary is supposed to have made a good beginning in the study of English, German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew. Those who preach in English and German will not utterly forget those tongues. They will be able to read them and understand them and to speak them; but that is not all that God and the Church expect of us. We are also to improve and grow

with respect to these noble tongues. But so far as the other three are concerned one will soon lose the use of them if he does not continue to study them. Some may think that such a loss is of little importance and consequence, but they are greatly mistaken. For independent and satisfactory exegetical work the minister must regularly study his Greek New Testament and his Hebrew Old Testament. If any have been guilty of the supreme folly of neglecting these languages in their career hitherto, they should make up their minds at once, by the help of God, to neglect them no more, but to become as proficient in them as possible. As for Latin, the minister should strive to become able to read it with as much ease and pleasure as he does English or German. If he lose his knowledge of Latin he will lose the only key by which some of the greatest treasures of the Church can be unlocked and enjoyed. The most important writings of our greatest dogmatists have never been translated into English or German, and probably never will be. And even if they all had been translated and translated well, we still ought not to be satisfied to be without the ability to read them with ease and profit in the original. No true scholar can feel perfectly satisfied with a mere translation however great its reputation for accuracy and beauty may be. There are idioms and terms of expression in every language which defy translation into any other. Great and unique as Luther was as a translator, he felt how imperfectly he was making the prophets and apostles speak German, and compared himself to a cuckoo trying to reproduce the strains of the nightingale. Goethe was right when he declared that you cannot translate the form and retain the form; and in language the form is often our only clue to the sense. We can never be sure that we are getting all that the words of a writer embrace and imply from a translation. Hence the minister should diligently continue his studies in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and thus keep the key to the priceless treasures of the Church and of the world bright by constant use and application. It would be well for the young minister to read the Vulgate and the Symbolical Books in Latin before he attempts to read one of the great dogmatists through; for in that way he will pass with pleasure and suc-

cess from one great treasure to another and with much benefit both to himself and to them that hear him. Those who have already read much in the way here indicated should of course not discontinue the good work, but go on conquering and to conquer.

What we have here said is in keeping with the advice given by Dr. Luthardt and Dr. Frank in their manuals for young theologians. Dr. C. P. Krauth, who is deservedly regarded as the most scholarly writer the English Lutheran Church in America has thus far produced, acquired his great scholarship and influence by ceaselessly studying the ancient and modern languages. In his study of the Bible he was in the habit of using the original text in connection with the Vulgate and commentaries in English, German and Latin. In his twenty-first year he wrote to his father as follows:

"I am now at the eighteenth chapter of First Samuel in my course of regular reading, but have read what is more than equivalent to it in every portion of the Old Testament. I grow, if possible, fonder of these biblical studies every day, and now feel myself almost independent in my investigations. I can read Hebrew passably—N. T. Greek as fluently as English, and, of course, the Septuagint moderately well."

III. So far as the pastor's time and his use of it are concerned it is not possible to lay down rules which can be carried out with clockwork precision. Much will depend upon circumstances. Some are obliged to spend much more time than others in the open air and in their pastoral visitations. For some it will be impossible to be regularly in their studies as some men count regularity. What is said on this point is therefore intended to be merely suggestive and to be put into practice as time and circumstances and individual temperament will allow.

In a general way it may be said that the minister is to be reading when he is not teaching. When we are not teaching we are to get ready to teach, and that we must do by reading and meditation. In order that our teaching may become fresher and more thorough we must constantly acquire new knowledge and broaden and deepen that which we have already attained, if we do not wish to be but little better than sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.

Those who can so arrange their time and labor as to

make it possible for them to spend their forenoons in their sanctums will do well to do so. The morning is generally considered the best period of the day for study. The mind is then more vigorous and better work can be done, as a rule, than at other times. Let the forenoons be set apart, therefore, for the more solid work in the study. One of the most successful ministers and pastors in America has said that he made it his custom to study his Bible in the forenoon and his parishioners' door plates in the afternoon. I think his rule is a wise one. A pastor must of course visit his people in order to become thoroughly acquainted with them and their wants. Next to the Bible he must study the book of human nature to assure his success. But for the latter study the afternoon is very suitable, for then both he and his people will have completed the more urgent work of the day. He will thus obtain both needed recreation and an opportunity to care for the souls of his people in a practical manner.

The forenoon and the afternoon being thus disposed of, let the evening be devoted to lighter reading and to social matters. Newspapers, magazines and wholesome fiction may be read with profit in the evening, when the mind is not in a condition, from having borne the burden and heat of the day, to engage in the reading of works that require profound thinking.

IV. I have already endeavored to show that not all reading is of the same importance. Says Francis Bacon, one of the profoundest thinkers that the world has ever seen: "Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested; that is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read but not curiously (that is, attentively); and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention." In the case of some books it is sufficient to read the title page and the table of contents; of others it will suffice to read only a chapter or two; but of others, such as Milton describes as being "the precious lifeblood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life," we are not at liberty to make so summary a disposal: they are to be chewed and digested and assimilated and made part of our own intellectual and moral fiber.

To this latter class belongs by pre-eminence the Book of books. The Savior does not say: Read the Scriptures, but: Search the Scriptures. He would have us regard them as a most precious mine, all of whose parts are to be carefully explored and worked over in the search for jewels and gems. Meditate upon the Holy Scriptures, give yourselves wholly to them; that your profiting may appear unto all. Do not read the Bible as you would a novel. Eat it as most precious manna, as angels' food, as the real ambrosia and nectar that the ancients merely dreamt of in their poetry. Compared to the Bible, the fabled Garden of the Hesperides was a desert. The garden of the Bible has growing in the midst of it the tree of life, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations and whose never-failing but perennial fruits are apples of gold in pictures of silver. Yea, God's Holy Book is more precious than the gold of Ophir and sweeter than honey and the honey-comb. Therefore eat it, chew it, digest it, assimilate it, until its precious life-blood courses in your every vein and glows in your every feature and purifies and sweetens your every thought, your every word and your every deed. Then indeed you will be workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth, and thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

A MIRROR FOR PASTORS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF GUTHE BY REV. W. E. TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

238. APPLYING OF CHURCH HISTORY.

The fact that God hears prayers, is proved by the three orphan-houses at Bristol, which George Müller erected and which are called in England "the wonder of the century." In the thousand great and small money and other crises the prayers of faith helped to remove the troubles. Thus, sometimes the flour, everything failed—he prayed and the prayer was gloriously fulfilled according to Luke 22, 35. In the institutions of the orphanage, which began in the year 1836

with twenty-six orphans and an income of 770 pounds sterling, there were supported in the year 1866 1,149 children; up to the year 1866 there were collected for the work altogether 233,485 pounds sterling. He never begged a single gift from any one for his work, but always implored, in child-like trust in the power and love of God, the help of Him who turns the hearts of men as the water-brooks.

Do not the experiences of Monica, of the German and the English Francke afford the most striking proofs that we have a living God? After such examples have been cited, it will be easy for every church member to see who has the best foundation,—whether he, who can pray and rests on God “the strange crutch,” or he, who knows nothing of prayer and is grounded only “on himself and the natural order of things.”

Historical examples often impress a truth on the soul much more powerfully than methodically prepared proofs. How incisive and abundant are the arguments which history furnishes in support of the truth: “Sin is a reproach to any people!” If the minister wishes, for example, to show his congregation that to the bitter fruits gathered by the individual from pantheism, materialism and atheism, belongs also black despair, horrible wretchedness in the face of death, let him conduct them to death-beds like that of Voltaire, of whom his physician writes: “This man, who so often laughed at hell and judgment, in his eighty-fourth year, when death drew near, shuddered as in the presence of the most terrorizing horror. He died in a passion, despairing and raging, like one who in his convulsions clings to the earth, which he does not want to leave.”

An apology for the divine power of the Gospel, which makes all things new and also creates a living hope, is to be found at the death-beds of the children of God—like that of Cecilia, who joyfully said, when death approached: “I die not, my misery dies”; like that of Bernard, of Clairvaux, who, full of Pauline happiness in the presence of death, prayed: “I long for Thee a thousand times, O Jesus, when wilt Thou come? When wilt Thou make me happy? When wilt Thou satisfy me with Thyself?” like that of Paul Gerhard, who, in the face of death, cheerfully cried: “And yet death cannot kill us”; of M. Ph. D. Burk, who with joy

looked forward to his death and with serene countenance said to his dear ones: "He does not fear death who hopes for life"; like that of G. H. von Schubert, who shortly before his end cried: "Dear Saviour—good Saviour—how glorious, how beautiful, beautiful!" Such death-beds are a living commentary on the passage: "Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him."

Should not the minister let his congregation share in whatever blessing he obtains in his oratory and his laboratory, in contemplation and in labor in the field of science? It is true that he will then have to cast off the yoke of homiletical and tyrannical fashion. We agree in this particular with the wish expressed two decades ago by Dr. Kienlen in his *Studien und Kritiken*: Vary the contents and the form of the religious address and change the sermon sometimes into historical narratives from the past or the present of God's kingdom, sometimes into popular comments on a longer portion of the Holy Scriptures, again into reading and explanation of good books of devotion, etc., so that the tedious thread from the address of the exordium to the amen of the peroratio be not begun and spun out or reeled off over and over again.

§39. TO THE GLORY OF GOD AND THE SALVATION OF MEN!

The sermon is to serve this end. Paul and the other apostles had this two-fold purpose in view in their preaching. They concerned themselves about men's salvation, not about human praise and favor. The apostle writes, 1 Thess. 2, 4: "But as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts," and Gal. 1, 10: "Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." The apostles had cast aside all desire for pleasing men or pleasing themselves. And we should go and do likewise. Human favor is a Delilah which has shorn the head of many a one who had given himself to God, and has robbed him of his power! He who preaches not to help, but to delight, who offers instead of spiritual food entertainment for the ear, that the old man may not be disturbed in its rest, can he yet claim to be a

servant of Christ, does he not rather deserve the title "actor"? Vinet says of a preacher who is a self-pleaser, and a man-pleaser: "The position of the Gospel minister is falsified; his noble independence, his true dignity is abandoned; he has bound on himself a yoke. He preaches no longer the Lord, he preaches himself, and by despoiling the temple, the extent of which spoliation is hard to be measured, the pulpit becomes a theater, a stage for his vanity. This judgment seems severe and yet, through earnest introspection it will be discovered to be often only too just. In pursuing oratorical triumphs the preacher may reap a harvest of applause; but for each bit of praise, a reproach will echo in his heart. O, may he prefer to that incense of flattery the silent esteem of a believing soul, which has heard him with devotion and whose heart he has touched! That would be a far greater triumph, that (what is supposed to be a masterpiece) to have aroused useless amazement."

The pleasing of self is one of the preacher's greatest enemies. If a Chrysostom, a Henry Müller, had to accuse themselves of this sin before the Searcher of hearts and also publicly humble themselves on this account before the congregation, where shall we appear? O how excellent is it for a preacher who can say with Jeremiah (17, 16): "Neither have I desired the woeful day," or with Augustine: "I seek your improvement, not your praise," or with Lütke-mann: "If I do not seek Thee from the heart, my God, and the honor of Thy name and the salvation of Thy people, then blot me out of the book of this life!"

§40. BEFORE THE SERMON.

The minister dare not ascend the pulpit as Uzzah approached the ark of the covenant,—without consecration and reverence. "Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from off thy feet!" (Ex. 3, 5)—he should remember the word of the Lord when he prepares himself to enter the holy place. Even the heathen Pericles never spoke before an assembly, without having previously prayed to the gods. "A teacher," says Augustine, "must first be a man of prayer and then a speaker (*orator antequam dictor*). Yea even in the hour when he comes forward to speak, before he opens

his mouth, must he raise the thirsting soul to God, that he may refresh it with that which he has received. If Queen Esther, when preparing to address the king in behalf of the temporal welfare of her people, prayed to God, that He would put the right words into her mouth: how much more should he plead for such a gift, who labors for the eternal welfare of men!"

Büghenagen strove to live up to this admonition. Lost in prayer, he one time forgot the right time for the beginning of the sermon; when called to the pulpit, he explained his tardiness to the congregation (Wittenberg), by saying that he had so much to say to God about the city and the land, the university and the state. Ambrose used to prepare himself for the sermon in the following prayer: "O Lord, I pray Thee and humbly entreat Thee, give me ever humble knowledge, which will build me up; give me gentle and wise eloquence, which will not vaunt itself and on account of its gifts lift me up above the brethren! Lay into my mouth through Thy Holy Spirit the word of Thy comfort and admonition, that I may be mighty for urging the godly in the way unto perfectness and to lead those who are on the wrong road by word and example to the norm of Thy truth. Let the words, which Thou wilt give to Thy servant, be sharp spears and burning arrows, which pierce through the hearers' hearts and inflame them to Thy fear and love." Melancthon used to pray quietly to the Lord before the sermon:

Fac, ut possim demonstrare,
Quam sit dulce, te amare,
Tecum pati, tecum flere,
Tecum semper congaudere!
(Help, that I may show,
How sweet it is to love Thee,
To suffer with Thee, to weep with Thee,
Ever with Thee to rejoice.)

Spener could say of himself that he "never approached his work without frequently calling upon God before and after writing the sermon, and also when the time came for its delivery." The preacher and hymn-writer Annoni prayed before the sermon;

Ich will säen, wäss're Du,
 Und sprich Dein Gedeihen zu!
 Ich will werben, sag's der Heerde,
 Heiland, dass sie folgsam werde!

Another preacher was accustomed to enter the pulpit with the prayer:

Duc ducem,
 Pasce pastorem,
 Aperi aperturo,
 Da daturo!

§41. THE DELIVERY OF THE SERMON.

Among the virtues which should adorn a servant of Christ, Paul names also dignity (Tit. 2, 7, gravity, *σεμνότης*). Dignity must also manifest itself in the delivery of the sermon. It dare not be affected, it must be internally true, the outflow of the consciousness of the heavy responsibility which is imposed on the office of the Word. Where this is present, all resort to illicit means of creating an impression will be held in contempt. Buskins, pathetic declamation, too lively gesticulation and action belong in the theater, not in the Church. Göthe cautions the minister to learn from the actor:

Such Er den redlichen Geminn,
 Sei Er kein schellenlauter Thor!
 Es trägt Verstand und rechter Sinn
 Mit wenig Kunst sich selber vor.

There is nothing, says Marheinike in his pastoral theology, which can more profane the sacred office of the preacher than this thing of keeping self always in view, this passion to shine, this striving after effect, to spread one's self pathetically with small thoughts or to rant and to act as if one had enthusiasm, instead of simply and heartily letting God's Word speak forth from one's soul.

‡42. AFTER THE SERMON.

One who can have a feeling of self-importance after the sermon, has not yet discovered and recognized the great difference between his person and his mission. From the mouth of Bernhard of Clairvaux, the doctor mellifluus, we hear after a sermon the lament: Woe is me, that I have spoken! And Luther says: How often have I spit on myself after the sermon! Richard Baxter makes the humble confession: Every time I leave the pulpit, my conscience rebukes me because I have not been more impressive and more fervent. I feel the impeachment less on account of a lack of ornament and elegance in speech, or because I have let drop a word which was not so beautiful in sound, but the inner voice asks me: How couldst thou with such a heart preach of life and death? How couldst thou preach of heaven and hell in such a careless, sleepy way? Dost thou believe what thou sayest? Art thou in earnest or in jest? How canst thou tell people what a terrible thing sin is, and that so much misery oppresses them and awaits them, without feeling these matters more? Shouldst thou not weep over such people, and should not thy tears interrupt thy words? Shouldst thou not call aloud and point out to them their transgression and pray and implore them to flee as in a matter of life and death? Truly this is the scourging of my conscience, which the ear hears, and yet my sleepy soul will not awake. O, how unfeeling and hardened is my heart! O Lord, deliver us from the calamity of unbelief and obduracy of heart, for how else can we be useful instruments for saving others? O do to our souls what Thou wouldst do through us to the souls of others! The preacher should not descend from the pulpit otherwise than with inward humiliation. If he is permitted to hear and see, that the Lord has blessed the weak word of his mouth, he should humble himself in the words: Not unto us, Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory! When on a certain occasion some one praised L. Hofacker for the beautiful sermon he had preached, he warmly repelled the praise, saying: The devil too has already told me that!

As prayer should precede the sermon, so should it also follow. The quiet labor of the preacher after the sermon is

ended consists chiefly in the prayer that the Lord would give the increase to the planting and watering, that He would bless His Word to all the hearers and to the preacher himself!

BIBLICAL RESEARCH NOTES.

The higher education of women in Germany is evidently destined to make slow progress in "that land of thinkers and scholars." The first gymnasium for girls, established several years ago by the National Society for the Education of Women in Carlsruhe, and which was intended to prepare young ladies for the entrance examination to the universities, has been discontinued, this step having become necessary by the disagreements among those having control of the school. Nor are the other two girls' colleges, that at Berlin and that in Leipzig, seemingly in very flourishing condition. As far as Prussia at least is concerned, there are no prospects that the school authorities will do the least toward the establishment of schools that will get girls ready for the university courses, nor will they officially recognize women as university students. This was made evident by the recent address of the Cultus Minister of Prussia, Dr. Bosse. Friends of the cause had petitioned the government to establish, in connection with the famous Victoria school in Breslau, courses for girls that would put these on the exact level with boys in preparing for the abiturienten examen. This the authorities refused point blank. When interpellated in Parliament about the matter, the Cultus Minister for the first time officially stated the position of the government on the mooted question. He declared that only by way of exception, when young women of matured judgment had applied for permission to prepare for a professional career and had been ready to pursue such studies, had the Minister, in connection with the University Rector and individual professors, permitted such lady applicants to pursue university studies. But the government would refuse to do anything that would invite or "coax" (anlocken) young girls, at an age when neither they nor their parents were in a condition to

know if the former were physically, mentally or morally able to engage in a professional calling, to decide upon such a course. The government will accordingly do nothing toward preparing girls for these callings, but in case some of exceptional gifts or determination are found prepared by private study or otherwise, the powers that be in Prussia consent to permit them to pursue their studies at the universities. The Minister repeatedly emphasized the fact that these were to be regarded as "exceptional" cases and not as precedents. Conservative papers and writers in Germany have warmly endorsed the position of this high dignitary and the address in question has attained a great deal of attention.

It is always interesting to hear what Catholic scholars have to say on questions of biblical research when they show an inclination to depart from the traditional path of ecclesiastical exegesis and do their own thinking. This it is that gives interest to the recent volume of Professor D. Schanz, of the University of Tübingen, entitled "*Das Alter des Menschengeschlechts*," which he considers from the standpoint of the Scriptures, of Profane History, and Prehistoric Data. He does not think that the Bible furnishes us absolutely decisive chronological data for determining the age of mankind. The deductions made from Gen. 5 and 11 are unreliable, because these records are not complete and are not exact, the latter appearing especially from the fact that so many ages are given in round numbers of tens. Then the great difference between the accounts of the Massoretic, the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuchs show how uncertain the Scriptural material on this subject is, although the Septuagint figures, which claim 5,000-6,000 years between Adam and Christ, are at least possibly nearer the truth. Accordingly the exegete on biblical grounds has the choice between 4,000 and 6,000 years B. C., and even this latter limit could, if demanded by external reasons, be passed over. And this seems to be demanded by the evidences of profane history, especially by the facts of Egyptian and Babylonian history, according to which a high state of civilization flourished in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile as early

as 4,000 B. C. In order to harmonize this with the account of the deluge as given in Gen. 6-9 and 11, either to place the deluge at a much earlier period than this is done in the Scriptures or to claim that the deluge was only partial and did not extend over these centers of ancient civilization. The data furnished by prehistoric research on the age of man, e. g. those of geology, astronomy, and palæontological sources, are exceedingly precarious and unreliable, and from a scientific point of view not trustworthy. Over against all these sources a decided sceptical attitude is entirely justified. In weighing the evidences furnished by these sources Schanz contends that the data of the Septuagint in reality are not more plausible and acceptable than is the Massoretic chronology, and in fact the latter is better accredited than the former. This conclusion he bases largely on his former work entitled, "*Lehre vom Urstand des Menschen*," and on the careful research of such men as Delitzsch in his *Genesis Commentary*, and recognizes in the different figures of the Septuagint a divine "*Zulassung*." Nor does he regard the evidences of profane, historical or prehistorical research as invalidating the chronology of the Massoretic text. The figures furnished by the history of the Pharaonic and of Assyrian and Babylonian records are on chronological matters of very doubtful correctness, as is especially apparent from the differences of specialists in this regard. We therefore have no reliable reasons for going back earlier than 4,000 for the beginning of the human race.

APOLOGETIC CRITICISM.

It is a hopeful sign when the advocates of the advanced and, as a rule, neological biblical criticism of the day, make it a point to demonstrate that it is not the purpose or aim of this criticism to change the fundamentals of the Christian faith. In this line the recent utterances of Professor Harnack, of Berlin, are significant, which he made in an apologetic lecture recently, issued under the title, "*Das Christenthum und die Geschichte*." He proposes to answer three questions: 1. Does the idea of development control-

ling modern scientific research permit us to separate as exceptional from the general course of events the one great fact of Christ and the establishment of Christianity? 2. Does not the fact that we are historically so far separated from these great events necessitate us to sever his personality from the great principles of His religion? 3. Has not historical criticism made the picture of Christ uncertain and unreliable to such an extent that we cannot base our faith on him? Harnack in each instance speaks a word for the historical conception of Christianity on the basis of the person of the Lord. Concerning the influence of modern criticism, for instance, he says, among other things, substantially this: Historical criticism has demonstrated that in the sayings and doings of the Lord as reported in the Gospels there are colorings caused by the times and the thoughts of the times. Yet the picture of Christ would lose its virtue and power only if it could be shown that the kernel and heart thought of the record had been marred or lost. Yet I cannot find that modern biblical criticism has changed anything in the essentials of Christ's picture. The same is true of His witness concerning Himself. Besides the four written Gospels we have also a fifth Gospel, not written, yet in many respects, plainer and more impressive than the written, namely, the testimony of the entire primitive Church. From this source we can learn what a powerful impression was made by His personality, and in which direction His disciples understood His word and self-testimony. Certain it indeed is that His garments too have been handed down traditionally; but the simple and grand central truths which He represented, the personal sacrifice which He brought and His victory in death—these became the new life of His congregations. And when the apostle, in Rom. 8, describes this as a life in the Spirit, and in 1 Cor. 13, as a life in love and divine power, he simply reproduced what he had personally experienced in his relations to his Lord Jesus Christ. And from these great facts and truths no historical criticism can change a particle; it can put them in a clearer light and only heighten our reverence for the divine which radiates from the Son of Abraham in this narrow world of ruins and decay. The simple-minded Bible reader must continue to read the Gospels as

he has been accustomed to read them, for the critic, too, can really not read them otherwise. What the former must regard as the real kernel and soul of the Gospels, the latter, too, must acknowledge as such.

THE NAME "JORDAN."

Of the meaning of the word "Jordan," Dr. C. F. Seybold, of Tübingen, proposes a new explanation in the *Mittheilungen* of the German Palestine Society, No. 1. The current etymology of Yarden derives it from yarad, to descend, the river being so termed on account of the rapidity of its descent. The "Aruch Completum" compares the Arabic warud, quick, as applied to a camel. The idea of rapidity is, however, not connected with the Hebrew yarad, which means simply to descend. The very form of the word Yarden is strange, and seems to be a kind of a contracted Aramaic dual, based either on the fact that the river Jordan, on account of the position of the Sea of Gennesaret is a double river, or because of its twofold headwaters. In the Talmud (Bekorot 55) Yarden is regarded as a contraction from Yared Dan, River of Dan. However, merely to call this stream "river" without a qualifying article would be scarcely acceptable. In parallel cases at least the article is present—cf. hannachar, the river—i. e., the Euphrates, or hayyeor; i. e., the stream or canal; i. e., the Nile. Stade, in his *Grammatik*, p. 176, declares that Yarden is not Hebrew, agreeing in this respect with Ewald. The older and more correct pronunciation of the word is the Greek and Latin form as found in Josephus, Pliny and Tacitus, and also the Septuagint, viz., ὁ Ιορδάνης, a form similar to korban, shulchan, etc., with which the Targum forms Yordena and the Syriac Yurdenan and the Arabic el-Urdunnu, which the Arabs derive from the root radana, to snore. An entirely new explanation is proposed by Seybold, based on the modern Arabic name of the river, which is esh sheria el kebire, i. e., the great drinking place (for cattle, etc.), or sometimes merely esh sheria, i. e., the drinking place as contrasted with Shariat el-menadire, i. e., the Jarmuk; for with the exception of these and sometimes the Jabbok, all the streams of the

Jordan Valley are without water in the dry season, and are therefore called wadis, or wild winter streams. In order to get water during the summer, man and beast from the entire surrounding countries therefore resort to the Jordan Valley (cf. Gen. 13, 10). We have also in the Arabic as a synonym of sheria the word maurid, i. e., way to the drinking places, from warada, to go down to the drinking place; and for this reason the word hay-Yarden is to be considered as equivalent in meaning with el-maurid, the equivalent of esh-sheria; but of the original specific idea of going to the drinking place the Arabic has developed in warada the general idea of going, or going to or arriving at a place, while the Hebrew yarad has developed the general meaning of descending.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XVIII.

OCTOBER, 1898.

No. 5.

THE LEADINGS OF THE SPIRIT.

BY REV. PROFESSOR L. H. SCHUH, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was made possible by adherence to two principles. First: That the Word of God is the only source of doctrine and life. Second: That the sinner is justified by faith in Christ. In this latter the Lutheran system of theology culminates. The burden of all Lutheran preaching to-day is: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." While Lutheran theologians, following their illustrious founder, Martin Luther, their more illustrious teacher, St. Paul, and their most illustrious Master, Christ, magnify the article of Justification, Calvinistic theologians emphasize the article of Sanctification. We do not disparage this article. God forbid! But we do not place it in the forefront of our system; but there where in the plan of salvation God has framed it. First the sinner is justified and then sanctified.

Sanctification in the wider sense embraces all the work of the Holy Spirit upon the sinner; all that work by which "He calls me by the gospel, enlightens me by his gifts, sanctifies and keeps me in the true faith." But in the narrower sense Sanctification refers to the daily renovation of the sinner, to his growth in holiness. In this we are to be led by the Spirit. His leading is an evidence of our sonship, for "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are

the sons of God." In regard to this leading of the Spirit, Lutheranism diverges from Calvinism. The latter sets forth theories which subvert the Scriptures and which in their practical application lead to rank fanaticism. It is well for every Christian to know when he is led by the Spirit of God. It will enable him to submit to such guidance and to resist other forces which may try to guide him.

We are led by the Spirit of God:

I. WHEN THE MOTIVES OF OUR HEARTS AGREE WITH
THE WORD OF GOD.

God has promised to lead His children by His Spirit. John 14, 16. 26. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth. But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 15, 26. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." John 16, 7. 8. 12. 13. "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness, and of judgment." "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come." These passages not only contain the promise of the Paraclete, but they also point out His work. He is to be the Comforter, and the guide of Christ's followers. He is to emphasize Christ's teaching and testify of Him. Another leader and teacher is promised, and He is to abide forever. After Jesus has withdrawn His visible presence from believers they are yet to have One under whose guidance they may complete their pilgrimage.

Such "another Comforter" is necessary because man in his present state is unable to guide himself. The con-

created law of God has been dimmed. The intellect is darkened. The will of God is not known to him; and even when known, man's will is perverted. He cannot choose the good. In the converted the intellect has been enlightened and the will liberated. Yet the light is not absolute. It has not its source within man. Another walks by his side as his guide and carries a light, by whose aid man is enabled to go forward. If that light is withdrawn or obscured, man is again in Egyptian darkness, so thick that it may be felt. There is a sphere in which man finds a sufficient guide in his own reason. It has not lost all its pristine power. In the domain of nature, reason though also suffering from sin, is a reliable guide. It has enabled man to accomplish much. But in the domain of grace, reason is blind and soon leads man astray. Here he needs another director; it must be one outside of himself. This Leader has graciously been given; it is the Holy Ghost.

This Leader is sufficient. "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." There is nothing unknown to Him, for He is the omniscient God. Those thoughts which from eternity occupied the Trinity; those thoughts which occupy us, of which we have an inkling but no solution, thoughts upon sin, death, judgment and eternity — all these He has searched out and now stands by our side as Counsellor and Informer. He guides into *all* truth, because He has fathomed it. How mercifully God has dealt with benighted man to give him such a competent guide! How foolish they are who reject His direction and depend upon their own darkened minds!

This Spirit of God dwells in the soul of the believer. 1 Cor. 3, 16: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" It surpasses the comprehension of our minds how the Infinite can dwell in the finite, how He who fills heaven and earth can make His abode in the narrow confines of a human soul, but the experience of believers is to this effect that there is an Unseen Presence within giving a new impulse to action, comforting us in sadness, spreading peace and joy and guiding and directing the mind. Experience is mightier than reason. What we cannot comprehend we know to be true.

Being assured of this presence in the soul and making certain of our mental activities by the aid of consciousness, nothing can shake our trust in this Biblical truth.

This indwelling Spirit communicates thought to man. As man is an intelligent being he must be guided through his intelligence. The mind is autonomic. God has so constructed it and recognizes His own work. He does not coerce the will, but He influences it. He brings thoughts to bear on the mind which make the unwilling willing. The secret processes by which He does this elude our observation; but the fact is patent. By processes which are adapted to the laws of our being He operates upon us and induces the mind to follow His guidance. God is an intelligent being. Mind meets mind; there is communion. This communion between intelligent beings is by thought. The Holy Spirit fills us with thoughts and so He guides us.

Thought may arise from various sources. It may arise spontaneously in the mind. The Creator has so made the mind that it may generate thought. Men have sought much to discover the hidden spring, but they have not yet succeeded, nor will they. Man's being is beyond his own power of comprehension. The Scriptures ascribe to the mind the power of originating thought. Matt. 15, 19: "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies."

But thought may be injected into the mind from without. Men may communicate the workings of their minds to us and thus may produce a similar process within us. Language of any kind is a medium of conveying thought. How the mind grasps ideas of others, how words start trains of thinking, has not yet been solved; but the fact is known.

An extraneous force which exerts a powerful influence upon the mind is Satan. Acts 5, 34: "Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" John 13, 2: "And supper being ended, the devil now having put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him —." The betrayal of Christ originated with Satan, was in some way communicated to Judas who became the tool of Satan to carry out the plan. Was Judas:

aware of this? Was he consciously working under Satanic agency? Or did Satan detect the besetting sin of Judas' heart, viz.: greed, and catching up this thread attach his own scheme thereto, and doing all so subtly that Judas knew not where his own thought ended and where that of the destroyer began? These and other questions are started by meditation on the narrative but not answered. Enough, we obtain an insight into the workings of Satan and are taught how to resist him, viz.: by force of will to drive wicked thoughts from the mind. What a revelation of Satan's power is given us. Here, too, mind meets mind; there is communion. The same unfathomable mystery presents itself, how may mind communicate with mind? But the fact remains. This communion may not always be a conscious one, but where it takes place it is not without effect. St. Paul tells us that Satan shoots his fiery darts at us. Wicked thoughts may come from without. Our experience is to this effect. In our holiest exercises, the train of thought is interrupted by an idea so repulsive and coming so suddenly that we shudder. By no force of will, nor by any discernable law of association has it come. True, association may sometimes be so remote, so indistinct as to be untraceable. But these heinous thoughts are so clearly *disjecta membra* that they can be accounted for only on the basis of extraneous injection.

Thought may be communicated by God. It necessarily follows from 1 Cor. 3, 16 that if the Spirit of God dwells within us, that He does so to a purpose and that this is to communicate with us. Further we are plainly told Phil. 2, 13: "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." 1 Cor. 12, 3: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." 2 Cor. 3, 5: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God."

The source of thought cannot always be accurately determined. Whether a wicked idea is just the natural product of the heart, such as according to the laws of its being it must bring forth, or whether it has been suggested by Satan, calls for a distinction finer than we are always able to make. Murder may originate in the heart; but the

murder of Christ originated with Satan. So that in some cases of wicked desires the initiative may be satanic and in others not. There is no law that will in all cases guide us. Let Christians consider all wicked thought as coming from the devil, for he is the originator of all sin. Then only will the battle against such mental states be aggressive.

Whether a good thought is the product of the regenerate heart, or the suggestion of the indwelling Spirit cannot be accurately determined. The regenerated heart with liberated will and sanctified faculties, with life where death reigned, may originate good thought. Yet to such a heart the Spirit may speak and may urge to holy activities. The regenerated heart coöperates with the Spirit. Who is the author of the idea, cannot always be answered. Christians who seek to glorify God will refer all to Him, because either directly or indirectly the good motives of our souls come from Him. Either He directly suggests them, or they flow from powers which He has quickened.

The Spirit directs our thoughts through the Word. At this point Lutheranism and Calvinism diverge. The former teaches that the Spirit works through the Word and through this only; the latter affirms that He may also work independently of the Word. Calvinism offers every shade of doctrine on this point, from those who affirm that the Holy Ghost works alongside of the Word, to such as the Quakers who reject it and are guided by an inner light. To these, the Spirit may guide a man entirely apart from the Word, thus emptying it of its power and denying its office as a means of grace. It will readily be seen that this Calvinistic doctrine opens the flood-gates of fanaticism. If the Spirit operates apart from the Word what assurance have we that the motions of our hearts, assumed to be holy, are not spontaneous (the work of the flesh), but the suggestion of the Spirit? When it is conceded that the regenerated heart may bring forth holy motions, how can we know which are the product of the natural mind and which the result of the Spirit? There is no guide. Then every thought which a man may consider good, may be ascribed to the Holy Spirit. But men may err. They may consider things pleasing to God which are the very opposite. When men have strong desires they are apt to make them-

selves felt and these are then erroneously ascribed to the Spirit. The vaporings of an excited imagination, hallucinations and dreams are all credited to the same source, and however contradictory the experience of different persons or even the same individual at different times may be, every motion of the heart is looked upon as the inspiration of the Spirit. In fact, these thoughts which plainly contradict the Word may still be looked upon as having a divine origin. Men may be led to neglect their calling into which Providence has led them and to begin to preach; they may be led to permit their families to suffer for want of bread; they may be led to kill off tyrannical rulers and usurping capitalists — in short there is nothing in the whole long list of virtues or sins to which men may not be impelled by powers which they claim to be divine. And when the appeal is made to such and the error is pointed out, what argument can be urged against their subjective experience? Certainly none, if the Word of God is not accepted as the standard. Man's consciousness is then the last court of appeals as to his mental states and activities. You might argue unto eternity with me that I do not remember having seen Mt. Tacoma, or Mt. Shasta. I do remember it and am conscious of this mental activity. If a man has a thought, even if it be to murder the President of the Union, if the Spirit works apart from the Word, by what proof will you convince such misguided soul that it is not inspired by God? By none. If he is conscious of having the thought he will depend upon the testimony of his own mind and he is justified in doing so; and if he insists upon it that it is not the product of his own heart, but that God has so commanded him to do, seeing that in times past God has commanded strange things, how will you even attempt to check him?

The Spirit works through the Word. In this He has revealed His mind. He remains consistent at all times. He never contradicts Himself. This Word is comprehended by the intellect. Then the divine mind is communing with the human. When the internal motions of the heart agree with the external Word, then we have an infallible evidence that He is directing us, then we cannot err. Let no man say: "I am led by the Spirit," unless

he can produce such external evidence. When I am aware of a motion in my heart to pray, to forgive enemies, to exercise charity toward the needy, I know that I am led by the Spirit, for to such virtues He urges me in the Word. These thoughts are suggested to the heart when the Word is heard, or when, according to the laws of memory, association brings them up. This Word is treasured up in the mind. The Spirit may quicken such remembrance at any time and we know that He often does plead with our souls and urges us to submission. To this drawing men should submit; and when they submit to the Word, they may truly say that they are guided by the Spirit. This doctrine leads to no fanaticism nor can it be used to ascribe to God the suggestions of the devil.

This drawing of the Spirit may be felt. God's Word has the power to influence the mind. When this hears the message, desires are awakened to do its bidding. Whether such longing is in the heart of the believer, he himself must decide; for consciousness bears testimony to what takes place within. Whether one yields to this awakened desire or opposes it, the individual alone knows. This submission to the Word is the evidence that the work of the Spirit has succeeded, that He is successfully guiding us. This leads us to another mark of the guidance of the Spirit.

We are led by the Spirit of God:

II. WHEN THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT APPEAR IN OUR LIVES.

"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another." Gal. 5, 22-26: "For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth." Eph. 5, 9.; 2 Cor. 4, 13; Rom. 8, 26; Eph. 1, 13. The presence of God's Spirit in the soul of the believer, will manifest itself in his life. These fruits are such as cannot grow naturally on the heart field. A foreign hand must plant them there. This Spirit is pure; His office is to sanctify the heart of man, so that instead

of its natural crop, murder, adultery, etc., it will bring forth a crop which is the planting of the Lord. When the acre brings forth thorns and thistles we do not attribute this harvest to any but natural causes; but when it produces a crop of wheat, we ascribe this to the influence of some foreign power. Some extraneous cause has prepared the soil and scattered the seed. Sin is the natural product of the human heart. When this is brought forth, we do not attribute it to any but natural causes; but when the heart brings forth righteousness, we conclude that a new force has been at work, preparing the soil and scattering the seed. There are some fruits in our lives which only the presence of the Spirit in the heart can produce. We must then from the effect reason to the cause. When these fruits appear, we may know, for our own comfort, that the Spirit is present and is leading us.

Under what conditions do these fruits appear? Christ says: "If a man will be my disciple, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." Without self-denial these fruits cannot appear. The Spirit may urge us to love, joy, gentleness, etc., but we may resist. We may prefer the light of our own darkened understanding; nothing is more natural. This impels us in another direction. It is only by the denial of self, by the subjection of reason to the teachings of the Word that the fruit will appear. This starts a conflict in the soul, that conflict of which St. Paul speaks Rom. 7. We are between two fires, self drawing us to sin, God drawing us to righteousness. The apostle in this chapter shows us a soul in this conflict: "For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that I do not: but what I hate, that I do. For the good that I would that I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. I find then a law that when I would do good evil is present with me. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." The result of this spiritual battle depends upon the decision of the will. If the will decides according to its natural inclination the battle is lost; if it decides according to the power granted of God, if it uses that liberty which the Spirit works, it may decide for good. Then it wars against

the evil inclinations of the heart, they are not willingly engaged in and they are uprooted. The path is marked out by God. Along this the conqueror walks and is led into all the blessed fruits of the Spirit. Jesus becomes his Exemplar. In everything He is imitated. In Him the fruits of the Spirit were complete. The more perfect the self-surrender the more perfect the fruits. Sin is still left; it has not the dominion over us, but it still lurks in the heart. The more the will conforms to the mind of the Spirit, the more sin will be subdued and the more the fruits of righteousness will appear. The more we look away from self to Christ, the more the life is made perfect. The great condition under which the fruits of the Spirit appear is total surrender of the will to the leadings of the Spirit.

In Christian life we cannot realize our ideals. When the fruits of the Spirit are not perfect, we must not conclude that He is not present. As long as we are in the flesh, it will exert its sinful influence. The deed will fall short — often far short — of the desire. But the desire is heaven-born. It is the fruit of the Spirit.

To men, the fruits of the Spirit appearing in our lives are the proof of the presence of the Spirit. But we know that this proof is not infallible. The exterior does not always truthfully reflect the interior. There is such a thing as hypocrisy. Experience proves that we have often been mistaken; the cloven foot of Satan often protrudes from beneath the cloak of Christianity. We may not infallibly know by a man's works whether he is led by the Spirit, but we may conjecture. However, the individual himself may know, for he may examine his own motives and thus determine the genuineness of his works.

Unbelievers may pray, attend the Holy Communion, take an active part in church work and engage in such other works as the Spirit suggests to the believer. The world may see the works of Christians and may imitate them; and the imitation may be so exact as to mislead us. But they do not deceive themselves, for they know what motives impel them. With the worldling the motive is self. He cannot get beyond this, for it is the centre of his being. The essence of sin is selfishness. This is the secret spring that prompts to all his actions. But the Christian has an-

other motive, viz.: the glory of God. The believer engages in good works that God may be glorified and that He may recognize the gratitude of man. This becomes the ruling principle of life. This differentiates the motives of the believer and of the unbeliever and explains why the works of the former are acceptable to God and why those of the latter are an abomination to Him.

Every person may examine his own motive, and may know for his own comfort whether he is led by the Spirit. Consciousness will give him the light. Under this searchlight he may examine his mental phenomena and if he is honest with himself the truth will become apparent. Motive may not always be purely the desire to glorify God, as the flesh is present and makes its desires felt. But even in mixed motives, the Spirit is present and makes our works acceptable. When the motive is born of the Spirit and is to glorify God, and when the mind is directed by the commandment of God, then the works are the fruit of the Spirit and are an evidence that we are led by Him.

May God evermore lead us by His Holy Spirit!

THE TARGUMS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

ORIGIN OF TARGUMS.

Targum is the technical term for the Aramaic versions or paraphrases of the Old Testament. The etymology of the word is not settled. Formerly it was derived from *ragam*, i. e. "to throw" (stones), and figuratively, "to transfer" or "translate," corresponding to *jacere* and *trajicere*. Pinches, however, discovered an Assyrian verbal root *ragamu*, to which he assigned the meaning "to speak," and from which the noun *rigmu*, "word" is derived. Fr. Delitzsch (*Heb. and Assy.* p. 50) accepts this as the true etymology of Targum, and translates *targumanu* as "the speaker," one who speaks for others by interpreting their words. Schrader (*KAT.*²517) gives to the root *ragamu* the meaning of "crying

aloud," "exulting." In the Old Testament the participle only is used, and that but a single time, namely in Ezra 4, 7, and rendered "set forth" in the R. V., but "interpreted" in the A. V. As a quadriliteral verb *targem* is often found in post-biblical Hebrew, in Talmud and Targums in the sense of "translating," or "interpreting." The word has found its way into nearly all modern languages, e. g. in the English "dragoman."

In origin and history these versions differ materially from the Septuagint. They are in no sense or manner the outgrowth of a literary movement or ambition. They arose from the necessities and needs of the worship in the synagogues, and their production was from the beginning encouraged and fostered by the religious authorities. Just at how early a date the masses of uneducated Jews forgot the Hebrew and adopted the Aramaic, thus making the use of Aramaic translations and interpretations a necessary part of public worship, cannot be accurately determined. The data for deciding this question are as meagre as are those for its companion problem as to what language, Aramaic or Greek, our Lord was accustomed to use. Neh. 8, 8 does not furnish a *terminus a quo*. The word there rendered "clearly," by the A. V., and "distinctly," or (in the margin) "with an interpretation," by the R. V. is, in the Talmud, explained by "Targum," (cf. Deutsch, Art. "Targums" in *Literary Remains*, p. 321). From this source Christian scholars formerly drew their date for the beginning of Targumic interpretation in the synagogue. It is known from good historical evidence that *written* Targums, and especially those yet in existence, can not antedate by more than a few years the Christian era. The earliest written Targum or translation mentioned is one on Job from the middle of the first Christian century. As Job is one of the Hagiographa and was not like the Law and the Prophets, used officially in the synagogue but generally only for private devotion, it is quite probable that written Targumin of the latter were in existence at an equally early date at least. The Talmud in its oldest portions describes the manner in which the Aramaic interpretations were given. A verse or paragraph was read in the original by the reader of the synagogue, which was followed by an interpretation in Aramaic,

not read, but given from memory, by the targumist. This was in harmony with the general principles of early Palestinian Judaism, according to which only the original word of revelation was to be used in public worship, the interpretation in the language understood by the people to be distinguished as human by the fact that it was only orally given. Just why, when and how this oral tradition became written tradition is not known. The probabilities are that the written form was intended to fix and harmonize this tradition.

TARGUM OF ONKELOS.

The best and most important of the Targums is that of Onkelos. Concerning the personality of the author we have only such data as are given in later Jewish literature. These, which have been best discussed probably by Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vortraege der Juden*, agree in this, that he lived about the time of the destruction of the second temple. The Talmuds, at one place make him a pupil and friend of the older Gamaliel; at another, they place him in the first half of the second century. They agree in regarding him as not a native Jew but a proselyte. These statements, together with the character of his Targum, have been the occasion of a great deal of speculation with regard to his person and his connection with Aquilas, the translator of the extremely literal Greek version of this Old Testament prepared for the purpose of supplanting the old and more free Septuagint. The identity of the two has again and again been asserted, but this view is generally rejected by competent scholars, (cf. the article Targums in the IX. edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*).

But the character and kind of the two versions are much alike. The Targum of Onkelos is really a translation, and that, too, a good one. While some of the later Targums are really interpretations, with incidental translations, Onkelos' is a translation with only incidental interpretation. As a rule it is very literal, even paraphrases being employed only at times. In poetical passages, such as Gen. 49, Num. 24, Deut. 32, 33, haggadistic amplifications and embellishments are introduced. Further departures from the original consist chiefly in circumlocutions employed for the purpose of doing away with the anthropomorphisms and anthropo-

pathics in the conception of the Deity, in accordance with the whole train and method of Jewish thought at that time, also in the Greek Alexandrian circles. Nöldeke, who is the best authority on the Aramaic languages, says of Onkelos, "the translation in the official or Babylonian Targum is throughout painfully literal, and even if this literal character does not make the frightful impression of Aquila's Greek, this results from the fact that the language of the Targum, on account of its close relation to the Hebrew, could adapt itself more easily to this idiom, and partly because we are so little acquainted with the real usages of the Aramaic language. Æsthetic and grammatical reasons never stand in the way of this literalness, but just as soon as such a rendition would cause offence or could lead to a misunderstanding from the point of religion, it is at once dropped and then the author does not shun wide circumlocutions." He says of the language that it is "a somewhat younger development of the Palestinian Aramaic already known to us in several of the books of the Old Testament" (cf. his *Die Alttestamentliche Litteratur*.)

The date of Onkelos' Targum is a disputed point. At an early age the version was regarded as a high authority by Jewish writers, having even its own Massora. The Talmud quotes it as such (cf. Frankel, *Zu dem Targum des Propheten*). The older view had accordingly been that it must be assigned to the first Christian century, a position still defended by so good an authority as Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds, Einleitung*. Frankel, chiefly for linguistic reasons, assigns it to the third century, and Luzatto even to post-Talmudic times. A somewhat strange view is that of Bleek-Wellhausen, § 287. In accordance with the idea that the earlier Jewish paraphrasing was the freest in character, which under the influence of the legal school lore was gradually curtailed and hemmed in to conform more and more to the words of the original, the literal character of the Onkelos version is regarded as an argument rather for its late than for its early composition. The present Onkelos is regarded as the outcome of a long development, the result of learned work and research. The writer says, "the Jerusalem Targum is indeed in its present literary form younger than the Babylonian [i. e. Onkelos], but it stands in a closer

connection with the old oral interpretation, while the latter grew out of the transforming reformation brought about by the learned men. The former is thus the wild outgrowth from the old roots; the latter is the shoot subjected to the direction of the hands of the gardener."

The text of the Targum has been frequently printed, e. g. in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf and in the London Polyglott. A critical edition of the text was issued in the first volume of A. Berliner's "Targum Onkelos," 1884. This is the best text and should be used in the study of the version. The literature and also the grammatical and lexical aids for the study of Onkelos and the other Targums are given with comparative fullness in the article on the subject in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. To the list there given must be added as extremely valuable, particularly for the vowel system and the philological side in general, the *Chrestomathia Targumica* of Merx, 1888. Brown's Aramaic Method will serve as an introductory book. The neglect which the text had suffered from the hands of scholars had prevented the issuing of a comparatively reliable text until recently, and with this had made it impossible to utilize thoroughly and satisfactorily the grammatical data furnished by Onkelos and the other Targums. It was only within the last few years that a satisfactory grammar of Biblical Aramaic could be prepared. The Massoretic edition of the Books of Daniel and Ezra by Baer and Delitzsch, enabled Kautzsch to do this much-needed work. Hence for lexical, grammatical and text-critical purposes these Targums have been rendering but meagre services so far. That they can render more and better service is plain from the writings of Lagarde, and this is illustrated by the excellent use made of the Targum by Cornill in his tentative reconstruction of the Hebrew text of Ezekiel (pp. 110-136), and, with not quite as good success, by Ryssel in his treatise on the text of Micah.

THE TARGUM OF JONATHAN BEN UZZIEL.

Jonathan, the son of Uzziel, is mentioned in the Talmud as the author of a Targum on the *prophetæ priores et posteriores*, i. e. the historical and the prophetic books of the Old Testament. He is said to have been a pupil of

Hillel, hence older than Onkelos and the Christian era. These data are discussed in Weber (p. 14). This Targum is not homogeneous in character as is that of Onkelos. Quite a difference can be observed in his treatment of the earlier prophetic books (Joshua, Samuel, Kings) and the later prophets (Isaiah and others). In the former he is more strictly a translator, paraphrasing only in poetic sections, such as the Song of Deborah; in the prophets proper he is remarkably free with explanations, additions, etc., so that he often falls into the manner of later haggadic and midrashic writers. For this reason it was supposed that the Targum was the work of two different writers; but since Gesenius this opinion has generally been abandoned. The language is, on the whole, the same as that of Onkelos. Concerning his age there is the same dispute as in regard to the date of Onkelos. A large number of scholars are willing to accept the traditional view of the synagogue and church as based upon the statements of Jewish literatures. Others, among them Jewish scholars like Frankel and Geiger, arguing from such internal evidence as language, etc., merely, claim it for the third or the fourth century, and maintain, as they do for Onkelos, that it is the result of the editorial work of the learned Jewish schools at Babylon, which are known not to have been established until the third century. This, however, is not understood as excluding the use of older documents in such editorial composition. Indeed, this is maintained as a fact, e. g. by Schürer, in his *Lehrbuch* (p. 479), who draws attention to the fact that Chaldee versions are mentioned in the Mishna and claims that some New Testament passages, e. g. Eph. 4, 8, show the influence of the Targumic method of interpretation in that era. Observe some interesting details in *Bleek-Wellhausen* (§ 287). A critical edition of the consonant text, based upon the excellent *Codex Reuchlinianus*, was published by Lagarde in 1872.

JERUSALEM TARGUM ON THE PENTATEUCH.

Altogether different in character and in every particular much inferior in value to the new classical Targums already mentioned is a second Targum covering the whole of the Pentateuch, which is sometimes claimed to have been pre-

pared by Jonathan ben Uzziel (Pseudo-Jonathan) but is now generally designated by the better term of Jerusalem Targum. All critics acknowledge it is a Palestinian product, its language, too, being that of the Jerusalem Talmud. It is further agreed, that it cannot possibly be younger than the close of the seventh century. In Num. 24, 19 it mentions the sinful city of Constantinople and in v. 24 the land of Lombardy; in Gen. 21, 21 it mentions the two wives of Mohammed Chadidja and Fatima. Compare especially the solid article of Volck, in Herzog. Real Encycl., 2d Ed. Vol. XV. The version can scarcely be called a translation; the text is for the writer only a pretext for introducing all possible midrashic notions. In Deutsch's article already mentioned (to be found also in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible) the English reader can find specimen verses in translation not only from this, but also from older Targums. Pseudo-Jonathan is full of myths and fables, ideas and representations common to late Jewish literature. The language is full of foreign words and barbarisms. But that it contains also portions of older Targums is evident from the contents (cf. especially Nöldeke, l. c.)

FRAGMENTS OF A PENTATEUCH TARGUM.

There is also preserved a Targum, improperly called the Jerusalem Targum, which contains, after the manner of Pseudo-Jonathan, translations and interpretations of a number of verses from the Pentateuch. It is now generally designated as Jerusalem Targum II. Concerning the relations of the two Jerusalem Targums to each other, which is acknowledged on all hands to be very close, there has been considerable discussion and about the same amount of disagreement. These fragments are Palestinian in character and language and are, perhaps, the remnants of a larger Targum. This, again, is disputed by some. Volck regards it as a "haggadistic supplement to Onkelos," it being clear that Onkelos is used by the author (cf. Schürer and Volck, l. c.).

TARGUMIN ON THE HAGIOGRAPHIA.

All of these are of a late date and their authors are unknown. The Targum on Ps. 108 speaks of Constantinople. Vol. XVIII—18.

tinople. We have a Targum on the Psalms, Job and Proverbs. That on Proverbs is comparatively literal. That on Psalms shows dependence on the Peshitto and is slightly haggadic; that on Job is very much so. The Targums on the five Megilloth (Ruth, Esther, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs) constitute a class of their own, and were composed after the Talmud. Of the Book of Esther there are several Targums. All these on the Megilloth are expositions more than translations. A Targum on the two Books of Chronicles was published in 1715 by Beck. It is a comparatively late production. The most complete bibliography of the whole Targum literature is in the article of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* by Dr. S. M. Schiller-Szinessey.

A MIRROR FOR PASTORS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF GUTHE BY REV. W. E.
TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

THE ACTIVITY OF THE CATECHIST.

§43. THE IMPORTANCE OF CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION.

Preaching is only one part of the official duties of the servant of Christ. To these duties belongs also the instruction of the youth in Christian truth. On this one should bestow great care. The earnest-minded heathen Juvenal has said: The greatest reverence is due the children. And the word of the Lord: Let the little children come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven — teaches the Christian catechist to look upon and esteem the children entrusted to him as "little majesties." The age of childhood is the most susceptible. Says Jean Paul: When could the holiest take root more favorably than in the holiest period of innocence? One should therefore well redeem this time.

The exceedingly great importance of religious instruction for the youth have at all times all men of God recognized, who have rendered valuable services in the extension of God's kingdom. We mention Cyril of Jerusalem, Didy-

mus, Gregory of Nazianzen, Augustine; the brethren of the common life; Gerson, Luther and Melanchthon, Spener and Francke, Richard Baxter, the Erlangen minister and professor Krafft and C. Im. Nitzsch.

244. THE PERSONALITY OF THE CATECHIST.

A man who is still engaged in the Ulysses-journey of seeking after the truth or is skeptical respecting the truth or is totally irreligious, is good for nothing as a religious instructor. Also he amounts to nothing as a teacher of religion, who indeed agrees to the truths of the Christian faith with the head, but in his heart remains wholly untouched by them. "Not the rationalistic, but the orthodox teaching imparted by a morally weak teacher is the most pernicious. In the unlearned a susceptibility to Christianity is preserved until later years. But in one who has under compulsion learned by heart the truths of Christianity from an unsanctified teacher, there generally appears a dullness which nothing can remove. He knows the mysteries of his faith, but to him they have become corpses, which can through no efforts of faithful ministers be awakened again to life." Instruction in religion cannot be given as for instance instruction is given in geometry: Christian truth, in which the religious teacher instructs, ought not belong simply to his understanding, it should be his personal property. Of I. Newton, who used to uncover his head at the mention of God's name, Jean Paul has said: He would have been a noble religious instructor for children; "since he, who would give to others, must himself have, and no one can teach religion unless he possesses it." Living spiritual powers can proceed only from him who has the spiritual life. But if the children, instead of the powers of the spiritual life, receive nothing else than mere words about spiritual things, it is not to be wondered at, as Jean Paul pointedly remarks in the *Levanna*, "that the stream of words, which are given to accompany youth into the sea of the world, that he may carry and control these words in that sea, is dissipated by the waves and winds."

‡45. THE RELATION OF THE CATECHIST TO THE
SCHOLARS.

The cardinal virtue, which the catechist dare not lack, is love. Every time upon going to meet the class in religion he should remember the apostolic song of love: Charity suffereth long, and is kind, charity envieth not, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things. The Moravian bishop Amos Comenius says of himself: "Men have censured me as a theologian, because I sought to benefit the world through improvement of the school system. As if Christ had not announced these two things and commissioned Peter with them both: Feed my sheep and feed my lambs! I give everlasting thanks to Him, my eternal love, for giving into my heart and blessing such love to His lambs." It would be desirable for all ministers to bear such love to the children. Under no circumstances let the minister carry into the class-room a gloomy, morose, sullen, peevish disposition! The children should see and want to see in him the disciple of Him whom the people of Nazareth called "kindness." Cheerfulness or joyousness, says Jean Paul, is the heaven under which everything thrives, excepting poison.

The kindly love of the catechist must not be a flabby, indulgent love like that of Eli. This is the grave-digger of authority, while love associated with holy earnestness creates and preserves authority.

The catechist should regard all scholars with equal love, he dare make no distinction between rich and poor, between those of gentle birth and those who are humble, not even between the gifted and the poorly gifted. The poorly gifted scholars (who as a rule have to sigh often enough during the hours of class because of unkind treatment, whilst those better endowed by nature are usually the teacher's favorites) he should rather treat with special gentleness and patience. "Alas," says Augustine, "that our hearts are not moved by the thought of the clucking hen, that covers her young with her weak feathers and calls the cooing chickens to her with broken voice. The more voluntary and more desirous of serving our love shows itself

in stooping to the humblest things, the more mightily does it permeate the inner being, but it seeks in those to whom it thus condescends nothing else than their eternal salvation." As the shepherd of the lambs the catechist should not only know the names of all his scholars, but should also make himself accurately acquainted with all their circumstances, in order that he may work upon each in a manner suited to those circumstances. Hearty interest in their joys and sorrows is the surest way to the hearts of the parents. If all the pupils would be infected with the catechist's holy love, the hour of religious instruction would be to them a sacred hour.

§ 46. DIVINE SERVICE DURING THE CATECHIZATION.

The hour for religious instruction should similarly be distinguished from the other school hours as the Sabbath is separated from the days of labor. But the catechist will only then succeed in diffusing a Sabbath influence over his scholars, when he is a man of prayer. He who cannot pray, says H. Zeller (in his *Lehren der Erfahrung*), can not educate. "Through prayer and intercession divine influences can be drawn from heaven upon the children's hearts and thereby changes effected in them which are not within the power of any man; for prayer and intercession touch the heart of the Lord, as the hand of that woman touched the hem of His garment, so that a power goes out from Him and falls upon those who pray, as well as upon those in whose behalf intercession has been made." It is not enough that the instruction be opened and closed with prayer, throughout the whole hour the spirit of devotion should rest upon the assembly. The edifying element should be combined with the didactic.

If the catechist is a singer, let him not neglect to begin and to close the catechisation with a spiritual song. Song has a mighty power over the heart. The culture of spiritual song in religious instruction is the best way for the reinstatement of song into the families.

‡47. THE PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING OF THE CATECHIST.

Pedagogical training is an indispensable requisite to the right kind of a catechist. Unfortunately this is not sufficiently valued by many of the clergy. Perhaps with the history of pedagogics the most of them are acquainted, but as important as is the study of the history of teaching — for whoever does not know the results of the past, does not comprehend the demands of the present —, still the study of the science of educating is not less necessary and important. Pedagogics must however be based on anthropological and psychological studies. How extremely important for the pedagogue is, for example, the careful study of the temperaments with their inclinations toward good and evil!

‡48. THE RELIGIOUS MATERIAL FOR INSTRUCTION.

Bible history is an eminent pedagogical power which places before the eyes the education of mankind through the great deeds of God. Instruction in Bible history is therefore the most important instruction for the children of all classes. Generally more time is devoted to the catechism than to Bible history. To the relegation of this study into a place subordinate to the catechism is attributable at least in part the great ignorance of divine things from which our age suffers. One should always keep in mind that it is first of all these narratives of the Bible from which living religion springs.

The child must learn to know the whole Bible history, also that contained in the Old Testament. "Just for the more tender age of childhood is the Old Testament especially important. The Old Testament is the children's testament. It contains the training of the human race from its childhood up to manhood; this education must be reproduced in every individual. — If the Old Testament has not become dear and holy to the child, it will with difficulty become so to the youth. The wonderful narratives are not a stumbling-block to the child. The child understands from its own innermost child-nature clearly and intuitively that mankind and Israel in their childhood had need of

such wonders for the sake of discipline; the child has its internal pleasure in the history of these wonders, beholds in them the Father's hand and heart and grows into the history of revelation." Let the first step be to relate to the children the Bible history; the next, that they themselves read this history, then let the explanation and application follow; the highest, to lead the children into the connection of the history of redemption, and to have them search for and read for themselves the Bible stories. If the children do not learn to find for themselves these narratives of the Bible, they will later on have difficulty in finding their way in the Bible and in winning a love for the book.

A diligent use of biblical history will contribute not a little to the illustration of the catechetical instruction. It is absolutely necessary, that the scholars be introduced into the building of Christian doctrine — into the understanding of the fundamental ideas of the Bible, into the closer relation which the individual truths of the Christian faith sustain to each other — otherwise looseness in religious views is inevitable. It is of great importance that the pupils be convinced of the biblicity of the doctrine. To this end the most careful attention must be paid to the passages of Scripture printed in connection with the dogmatic statements of the catechism. Sad to say, this is not the rule. It has not been said so very wrongly, that the dogmas of the catechism have been honored like a rich lady, on the other hand, the Scripture passages have been dismissed like a poor maid-servant, because the latter are too often not explained sufficiently to bring out the bare meaning of the words, not to speak of drawing out properly the instructive and edifying contents and presenting these to the understanding.

The scholars should also be made acquainted with the most important things in Church history. "The individual member of the congregation should not merely stand in a certain relation to the individual congregation, but also in relation to the whole of the Christian Church; he should not as it were be precipitated into the Christian congregation as into a large, unknown chaos."

The pearls of the Church's hymnology are likewise not to remain unknown to the scholars. One should also

not omit to communicate whatever in the history of the origin or blessed influence of these hymns is edifying. If the children learn the hymn: "If thou but suffer God to guide thee," relate to them the circumstances under which it was composed: G. Neumark in the year 1653 fell into such great poverty, that he was even forced to pawn his beloved viola di Gamba, upon which he was such a skillful performer. When God did not permit his confidence to be put to shame and helped him out of his need, so that he could redeem his viola di Gamba, he composed the beautiful hymn so expressive of trust in God, and when he had finished writing it, he immediately played it amid tears of thankfulness. Koch's "*Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*" is a rich storehouse upon which to draw in this respect.

§ 49. PREVALENCE OF THE ACROAMATIC FORM OF TEACHING OVER THE DIALOGUE.

When imparting the divinely revealed truth, the acroamatic form of teaching should predominate over the dialogue. Yet the former should not continue too long, without passing over to the latter in questions intended for arousing the attention, for developing the matter in hand, or for impressing the conscience. In general Dr. J. T. Beck is right when he says: In teaching, the acroamatic form should prevail, in order that the work may really be edifying or spiritually strengthening, but in such a way that the teacher speaks to the heart and treats his subject according to the law of concentration. The formal method of asking questions is intended to be helpful in attaining the main object, in so far as it tends to awaken attention, to aid in thoroughly understanding and retaining the subject, in summing up settled results: the sensual memory and the natural understanding can and should be prepared thereby for the teaching of the Spirit. But there are also questions which do not touch upon the form of thinking, but upon the matter and its real appropriation, realistic questions, as they especially present the discourses of the gospels, questions which draw out from the innermost recesses of the heart and lead again into the innermost recesses, which lead to self-examination, to the inner life

and experience, to a voluntary and spontaneous confession. Logical dexterity does not belong to the putting and developing of such questions, but moral maturity, not merely frankness, but also delicacy, in order not to be a rigid manipulator of forms or an obtruding inquisitor and judge, not only such treatment as awakens confidence, but also that wisdom, which understands the hidden paths of the inner life and the way of truth and the guidance of souls; a wisdom which knows equally well when to press further and when to break off, to use what is at hand or to surprise with new turns. Compare especially the conversation with the Samaritan woman.

§50. CLAIM ON THE TOTALITY OF THE SPIRIT.

The catechist has to deal with the whole man, he must not convey the truth merely to one or the other faculty of the spirit, but to the undivided, whole essence of the spirit: to the *νοῦς*, to the soul (not to be confounded with the feelings!). What Dr. J. T. Beck says on this point is highly worthy of notice: The whole peculiarity of the biblical form of teaching is not to set up according to the forms of thought and unfold a string of bare doctrinal statements for the production of knowledge; it is not to be a text-book of religion, but the Bible doctrines should and are intended to bring truths as convictions of the heart from the heart to the heart, i. e. to stamp them on the innermost centre of life. The biblical form of teaching does not operate especially on the memory and the reasoning, not on the feelings, not on work and practice, but it seizes on man by the roots of his feeling and aspiring, of his thinking and willing, in his innermost feelings and inclinations, in the fundamental thoughts and movements of the will, which as the inner power urge man on; it awakens and cherishes the deepest, ineffaceable movements of the idea of truth and right, the movements of the conscience, the most irrefutable, most impressive experiences of our sin and our misery, as well as the ever restless, inscrutable drawings and impulses toward the highest, eternal good. Thus taking hold of the secret work-chambers of the inner life, the biblical form of teaching bends the original threads of our being and mov-

ing, in order, when man surrenders himself, to imprint its own higher truth upon the very core of the spiritual life; thereby it gains and vivifies a power, which influences all sides of the soul-life, so that the implanted truth can and should unfold itself in all the essential forms of life as feeling, thinking, willing and acting. The biblical method of instruction is therefore called a sowing, planting, begetting and bringing forth, taking root and bearing fruit, as its means of teaching are called living word, spirit, power, seed; it is a mode established for engendering life, the generative method. He who would apply himself to teaching according to the biblical original, as follower of the Lord and His ambassadors, in order to share with them in their harvest, must learn before all else to address the heart as the Holy Scriptures intend. This is not done according to their intention, when one speaks the warm, energetic language of the feelings, of the imagination, etc.; this is, according to the Scriptures, only a psychic (naturally-spiritual) or carnal way of speaking, which neither takes hold of nor can instruct the mind and being of the Christian spirit (1 Cor. 2, 14). The biblical language of the heart, whether it has to do with ideas or with the emotions, with willing or acting, grasps all this in its inner concentratedness, so that the thinker, the man of feeling, the practical man will indeed not be seized and satisfied with respect to his distinct partiality, but each one is struck at heart, so that, if he does not resist, he will be brought to himself, to turning his thoughts inward and collecting himself. So little as one can say of such biblical discussion and form of address for the heart, that it is purely thought or logical throughout, so little also, that it is illogical; much rather is it characterized by thorough thought, but deep, pithy thought. Just as little can it be said of the biblical form of speech that it is full of feeling and is touching; and yet it is so little without feeling and emotion, that the deep warmth of life and powerful inwardness, tenderest and strongest feeling breathe and flow forth from it. And if, in the ordinary sense, it is not practical, on the other hand it is just as little unpractical; rather, life pervades it, a life purified and to be tested in experience and practice, only not life in its confused, indistinct externality, but an internally rich,

full of character, with a drastic (pressing to decision) expression and impression of the truth.

§51. CONTINUATION.

The catechist has not to deal primarily so much with the exercise of the understanding, as with the exercise of the memory. The child must first learn to support and cultivate its own words and thoughts by means of others' words and thoughts. "To appropriate the thoughts of others in fixed words and to ponder them in the heart is a greater blessing than to bring forth immature thoughts in what are called one's own words." It almost seems to be the present fashion to engage in polemics against the memorizing of Bible passages and of hymns. Perhaps we will be justified in citing some authorities for the great value of the memory.

K. v. Raumer says in his history of polemics (III, pp. 34, 35): "It is an equally kind and wise arrangement of our faithful God, that in the memory He has granted us a spiritual store-room, in which we can save seeds for the future. The ignorant man thinks these seeds are dead; not so he, who knows that at the right time their energetic life-power, budding and swelling, unfolds itself. The boy learned the passage: "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." In his early years he knew no trouble, and so he did not understand the passage. But when, arrived at manhood, a time of unbounded, overwhelming need draws upon him, there suddenly appears before his soul, like a helping angel of peace and comfort, that passage, he understands it, yes he more than understands it.—When children learn the verse: Wenn ich einmal soll scheiden, so scheide nicht von mir—they do not understand it, the thought of death is a stranger to them. But old men pray in the hour of death that same verse which they learned when they were children; now they understand it and even more than understand it. During the seven years of plenty Joseph gathered stores for the seven years of want; when the time of need is at hand, it is too late to gather.

R. Rothe (*Stille Stunden*) repeatedly expresses himself on the importance of the memory. Thus: A man with a poor memory is literally a poor man.—He who has a poor memory will remain his life long a miserable ignoramus and bungler in all science.—A scientific head with a wretched memory is a prince without domain and people.—A good mind with a very poor memory has the task of a Sisyphus.

J. C. Erdmann (*Psychol. Briefe*) writes: To impress the memory is in the intellectual realm what obedience is in the practical.—One learns by appropriating what has been thought. In old age learning becomes difficult, but age is appointed for something else, for reflection. If one has neglected what must be learnt in youth, the difficulty in learning later is the merited punishment. If the intelligence of children is according to its conception memory, it is evident that for them the only measure of the energy of the intelligence is the memory. There is only one method of measuring the child's talent, by its memory, as there is but one by which to measure morality, obedience. At the same time that a false system of pedagogics turned obedience out of the world by proposing always to give children the reasons for every commandment, in the same time men gladly began their polemics against the memory. As it was expressed, the understanding, instead of the memory, should be exercised. This made children precocious, that is stupid, because whatever is wise in old age, would be stupidity in childhood, just as that training in the practical life makes the children bad and immoral, because, what later on is a moral demand, in childhood is repugnant to the understanding, i. e. bad.

Of high importance is the use of the conscience. Without this there can be no religious training. The conscience of the Christian child is different from that of the heathen child. The Christian child is supplied with the baptismal grace and placed under the influence of the Holy Ghost. The catechist dare not leave this unnoticed. The conscience is "a vessel, into which the right content must be poured; this content however is nothing else than the divine Word, both law and gospel. The educator's most

the ingenuous and actively receptive soul with the rich material which lies before him. It is better that the pupil learn to know the demand of the law, before he is led to it through transgression; he prefers to learn to know sin in the shape of certain persons or even in the form of a fearful crime from the history of the old or new covenant rather than from the life and judgment of the world, which often purposes veiling a matter and exercises a dulling influence; he ought finally to become acquainted with the full faith in the blessing of the redemptive work and the power of forgiveness, that he may feel obliged, when surprised in his more and more wakeful and active conscience into a deviation from the commandment and into wicked deeds, not only to practice inward discipline upon himself in true contrition and resigned repentance, but also to seek the loving forgiveness which beams forth to meet him from the eye of his teacher who but stands in the place of God. The more lax and the blunter public judgment shows itself in our time respecting moral actions and conditions, the more conscientiously should the training be conducted, so that the child's moral judgment may as early as possible be sharpened and cultivated, before repeated transgression, into which riper age is accustomed to fall only too easily, has ever and again blunted and weakened the feeling.

If the vessel of the conscience is thus filled up with the contents of God's Word, then the tree of knowledge will at the same time be nourished. The question, what is necessary to be taught and what can be dispensed with, is not so easily answered. Many a one banishes from the religious instruction as sterile theological subtlety, what is of religious value to the simple Christian. Indispensable to every Christian is the clear knowledge of sin and grace, of the work and the person of Christ, of reconciliation and redemption, of repentance and faith, of justification and sanctification. The catechist must earnestly take into consideration the intellectual powers of the scholars and fight against mental sloth — for how else will they be able to give before every one a reason for their faith! "Yea, in a time of skepticism like ours, it is imperatively necessary to present the totality of the material of revelation in its

(rightly comprehended) general-human material of science and culture. — What help is the catechetical instruction, if the catechumen is left such a child, that the first silly appeal of a journal to the Copernican system upsets the whole building of his faith!" In thorough instruction the catechist can not leave unnoticed the contradiction of the world to the truth. But not too many apologetical pillars must be erected, for the multitude of pillars darkens and contracts the churches, as Jean Paul says. Christian knowledge has no small influence on the will. Unfortunately the least attention is paid to the cultivation of the will. That is one reason why religious instruction is so ineffective. The training of the will should be looked on as the centre of Christian pedagogics. He who gains the will for the truth, moistens not only individual branches, but the root, which then animates and refreshes those. Christianity is preëminently a matter of the will. No one believes except willingly (*nemo credit nisi volens*). Luther calls faith the living will within us. And Claudius writes in the VI letter on the conscience: Only in the will is there counsel, nowhere else. — When a man has come so far that he can say in truth: I *will* not live to myself; I prefer the noble and the good; if that is not allotted me, the mean and the evil I *will* not, slave I *will* not be —, when a man can say that at all times, the good conscience is not remote. M. Carrière says: "Because Christianity is not mere doctrine or law, because it is deed and life, a goodly life of love within us, therefore it can not be grasped by the understanding alone, therefore it must be experienced, felt through sorrow and joy of the internal development born within us; therefore the understanding desires the sanctification of the will; for not the aristocratic endowment of intellectual contemplation, but the pure heart is the organ of the truth." Especially must we work to cultivate the will in those who are of a sanguine temperament, by whom the will-power is regarded as inferior to feeling and knowing. The catechist must strive to attain both: a Christian way of viewing the world and a Christian bent of the will.

§52. INTO THE DEPTHS—FOR ETERNITY!

Into the depths of the inner life must the catechist sink the truth. A good builder, says Hamann, works down into the earth, before the slightest mark appears above ground. The faster one hurries to the light with the latter, so much less is the foundation worth. Let the catechist guard himself against the vanity of showing visible results of his religious instruction. The confirmation examinations offer a great temptation thereto. Many a minister attempts to make a display with the more gifted of his scholars, by causing them to parade the religious knowledge which he has taught them! Dr. J. T. Beck calls that catechist a day-laborer who does not work for eternity, before God and for God!

§53. ABIDING RELATION OF THE CATECHIST TO HIS SCHOLARS.

The catechist must aim to maintain the relation to his scholars beyond the time of instruction, to follow up their course of life, to employ their joys and sorrows for the further improvement of their inner being. In the period of youth, so full of danger, is it especially important, as an approved pedagogue has said, to approach the youth with the quickening warmth of a sympathetic love, and not to let it appear as though the attention paid him is only a sort of scrutiny, and the encouragement offered is at the same time given in the spirit of a censor. The formation of young people's associations is heartily to be recommended.

This leads to a new field of labor: To the activity of the pastor.

THE ORDER OF SALVATION.***IN SHORT AND PLAIN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.**

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY REV. WM. M. KIBLER.

1. What are you by nature? I am a sinful man.
2. Who created you man? God created me.
3. Do you then believe that there is a God? Yes; I believe that there is a God.
4. Can we see God? No; in this life we can not see Him.
5. What then is God, since we can not see Him? God is a spirit. Or, an uncreated, spiritual, and most perfect being.
6. Is there then more than one God? No; there is only one God.
7. What is the one God called? The one God is called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.
8. Are not then Father, Son, and Holy Ghost three Gods? No; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three persons, and these three persons are one God.
9. Has then God no beginning? No; God is eternal, and has neither beginning nor end.
10. Where is God? God is present everywhere.
11. Does then God see and hear all things? Yes; God knows everything that occurs in all the world.
12. Is God then also able to do all things? Yes; God is almighty; He can do whatever He pleases.
13. Has then God created the whole world? Yes; God is the almighty Creator of heaven and earth.
14. Can that which God has created uphold itself? No; as God has created all things, so also does He preserve and govern them.
15. Does sin also proceed from God? No; nothing evil can proceed from God.
16. Is then God altogether without sin, holy and good? Yes; God is the Highest Good, and there is no evil in Him. He is true, holy, just and good.

*This is translated from Dr. Luther's Smaller Catechism, published in 1829 by G. A. Sagg, Reading, Pa. The proof passages are omitted in the translation.

17. But how have you become a sinful man? I have inherited the sin of Adam, the first man.

18. How many people did God at first create? God at first created two people, namely Adam and Eve.

19. Of what does every man consist? Every man consists of a body and a soul.

20. Of what did God make the body of the first man? God made man of the dust of the earth.

21. How did God give the soul to man? God blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.

22. Whose image was man, created by God? Man was a perfect image of God in soul chiefly, and in body.

23. What is the soul of man? The soul is a created spirit, having reason and will.

24. How was the understanding of man created? The understanding had a heavenly knowledge of God and His will.

25. How was the will created? The will had divine power to love and to do good, and to hate and refrain from evil.

26. What is the body of man? The body is the visible part of man with which the soul is united.

27. How was the body of man created? The body of man before the fall was holy, perfect, and immortal.

28. Had then man, when God created him so noble, no sin nor misery? No; man had at first no sin, and not the least misery, neither in soul nor body.

29. How then did Adam and Eve become sinners? Adam and Eve fell from God.

30. Who seduced these first people? The devil seduced the first people.

31. What were the devils at first? The devils were at first good angels.

32. Who created the angels? God created many good angels.

33. What are good angels? Good angels are holy and blessed spirits.

34. What do the good angels do? The good angels praise God, serve Him, and protect the pious.

35. How did some good angels become devils? Many good angels fell away from God and lost their uncreated holiness.

36. What are bad angels? The bad angels are unholy and unblessed spirits.

37. What do the bad angels do? The bad angels seek to hinder God's honor and will, and to deceive man.

38. Whereto does the devil deceive man? The devil deceives man to become disobedient to God.

39. What then, precisely, was the Fall of Adam? The Fall of Adam was, that man turned his heart away from God to the devil.

40. Wherein were Adam and Eve also outwardly disobedient to God, and obedient to the devil? Adam and Eve ate of the tree of which God said they should not eat.

41. What did man lose when he obeyed the devil and fell from God? Man lost the perfect likeness of God, and became an image of the devil.

42. How, now, after the Fall, are man's soul and body created? Soul and body are incapable of all good, and capable and inclined to evil.

43. Whereby now has sin come upon all men? Sin and death came upon all men through the Fall of Adam.

44. What is sin? Sin is everything bad, and unrighteous, or everything contrary to God's commandments.

45. How is the sin which has come upon us from Adam called? The sin which we inherit from Adam is called original sin.

46. From whom now does sin come? Sin comes from the devil and man.

47. Do we ourselves then do no sin? Yes; we sin very much daily.

48. How are the sins which we do called? The sins which we do are called actual sins.

49. Whereby do we sin actually? We sin daily in thoughts, actions, words and deeds.

50. Of how many kinds is sin? Sin is of two kinds: original and actual sin.

51. What is original sin? Original sin is the inborn corruption of our nature on account of which we are incapable to all good and inclined to all evil.

52. What is actual sin? Actual sin is everything evil committed by us internally in thoughts and desires, and externally by actions, words, and deeds, or all good omitted.

53. How do we become partakers of others' sins? When we command, advise, approve, do not hinder, nor reprove sin, nor warn against its punishment, we thus become partakers of other men's sins.

54. What do we deserve on account of sin? We all deserve God's wrath and displeasure, temporal death, and eternal damnation.

55. Must then all men be damned? No; we can regain lost blessedness again.

56. Who interested Himself in us that we might not be damned? God, out of mercy, befriended us all.

57. When, already, did God conclude to save fallen man? God determined already in eternity to redeem all men, and to save believers.

58. When did God promise man a Redeemer? God promised immediately after the Fall to give us a Redeemer.

59. Who is our Redeemer? Jesus Christ is our Redeemer.

60. What does *Jesus* mean? *Jesus* means Savior.

61. What does *Christ* mean? *Christ* means Anointed, and is equivalent to Messiah.

62. Who is Christ? Christ is God's Son, true God and man.

63. Did God then give even His Son to be our Redeemer? Yes; God gave us His Son when the Son of God became man.

64. Of whom was Christ born? Christ was born man of the Virgin Mary.

65. Why must Christ become man? Christ had to become man that He might be able to redeem us through suffering and death.

66. Why must Christ be also true God? Christ had to be true God that His redemption might have power to reconcile God.

67. Whereby did Christ redeem us and reconcile God? Christ reconciled God by His obedience unto death.

68. What did Christ fulfil in our stead? Christ perfectly fulfilled in our stead the whole law of God.

69. What did Christ take upon Himself? Christ took upon Himself the guilt and punishment of our sins.

70. What then did Christ suffer for us? Christ died for us and shed His blood for us on the cross.

71. Did Christ remain dead in the grave? No; He arose again on the third day.

72. What became of Christ after His resurrection? He visibly ascended into heaven.

73. Where did Christ seat Himself? Christ sits at the right hand of God to bestow upon man the acquired salvation.

74. Whom did Christ redeem? Christ redeemed all men.

75. From what did Christ redeem us? Christ redeemed us from all sin, from death and from the power of the devil.

76. What on the other hand did Christ acquire for us? Christ acquired for us God's grace, the Holy Ghost, and eternal salvation.

77. Will then all men be saved? No; there will be only a few saved.

78. Who is to blame that so many people will be lost? Men themselves are to blame for their damnation, because they choose to remain in their sins.

79. Who will be saved? Those who accept Christ in faith will be saved.

80. Can you by your own strength believe in Jesus Christ? No; I can not by my own reason or strength believe in Christ.

81. Whom must you obtain of God by prayer to give you strength to this end? I must pray to God for the Holy Ghost.

82. What does the Holy Ghost work in us? The Holy Ghost sanctifies us.

83. Are you then not holy by nature? No; I am by nature unholy.

84. What makes you unholy? Sin makes me unholy.

85. How will you now become holy? When I become free again from sin, I become holy.

86. What does the Holy Ghost do when He frees us from sin and makes us holy? The Holy Ghost calls, enlightens, sanctifies, and keeps us.

87. How does the Holy Ghost call us? When we hear the Word of God, thus the Holy Ghost calls us from sin and from the power of the devil, again to God.

88. How does the Holy Ghost enlighten and sanctify us? The Holy Ghost works in us faith in Christ, and makes us altogether new creatures.

89. Has then faith such great power to free you from sin and to sanctify you? Faith has power to justify and sanctify a sinner.

90. How does faith justify you before God? When my faith embraces Christ. I then have Christ's righteousness and forgiveness of all my sins.

91. How does faith sanctify? Faith restores in us the image of God, and enables us to rule over our sins and to live a holy life.

92. When did the Holy Ghost begin in you this sanctification? The Holy Ghost began sanctification in me in Holy Baptism.

93. What did God promise you in Holy Baptism? God promised to me forgiveness of sins, life and salvation, and also bestowed it.

94. But what did you promise? I promised to renounce the devil and all his works and all his ways, and to believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

95. Through whom did you make this promise in Holy Baptism? I made this promise in Holy Baptism through my sponsors.

96. Who should be chosen for sponsors? For sponsors should be chosen pious Christians who themselves keep their baptismal covenant.

97. What is the duty of sponsors? The duty of sponsors is, that they be devout at the baptism, awaken their faith, pray for the children, and diligently remind them of their baptism.

98. Are then all who are baptized, holy and pious people? No; many fall away again from their baptismal covenant.

99. Whereby does one fall from his baptismal covenant? One falls from his baptismal covenant through wilful sins.

100. What is a wilful sin? When one sins willingly and designedly.

101. Whereby can a wilful sinner be again sanctified? He can be sanctified again through the Word of God.

102. What is God's Word? The whole Bible, or the Holy Scriptures, is God's Word.

103. What now must he who would become pious and holy again hear and learn? Whoever would become pious must diligently and devoutly hear and read God's Word.

104. When does one hear God's Word with true devotion? When with God's Word at hand he heartily longs for the enlightenment of the Holy Ghost.

105. What can we learn from God's Word? We can learn from God's Word everything needful for our salvation.

106. What does God's Word reprove in us? God's Word reproves all our sins.

107. Where to does God's Word admonish us? God's Word admonishes us to repentance and conversion.

108. What now is the order in which man can be saved? The only order of salvation is, repentance and, especially, faith in Christ.

109. What is repentance? Repentance is a change of heart and mind.

110. How many parts are there in repentance? Repentance has two parts: contrition for sin and faith in Christ.

111. What must one lament if he would be converted? Whoever would be converted must heartily confess all his sins, lament and hate them.

112. What does God work when one has true sorrow and anxiety over his sins? When one is full of anguish on account of his sins, God works faith.

113. In whom especially should we believe? We should believe in Jesus Christ our only Redeemer.

114. Is that true faith when one without hearty sorrow says with a bold heart: I comfort myself in my dear Lord Jesus? No; where there is no hearty sorrow for sin, there is also no true faith.

115. When then do we rightly believe in Christ? When we are alarmed on account of our sins, regard them as great, and rejoice and comfort ourselves in the Lord Jesus only, we then rightly believe on Christ.

116. What is true faith? True faith is a living trust in God's grace in Christ wrought by the Holy Ghost.

117. What must follow as a proof of true repentance? Amendment of life must follow repentance.

118. Wherein does amendment of life consist? Amendment of life consists in following Christ.

119. How do you follow Christ? I follow Christ when I deny ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this world.

120. Do all wilful sinners repent? No; most people remain impenitent in their sins.

121. How many classes of people are there? Two classes: some repent, and are godly; the majority live without repentance, and are ungodly.

122. Can then the ungodly do no good works? No; whoever has no faith, can also do nothing good.

123. Can believers do good works? Yes; believers strive day by day to become more godly.

124. Can believers live wholly without sin? No; believers still sin much daily through weakness.

125. What is a sin of weakness? When a believer sins unknowingly or unguardedly, it is called a sin of weakness.

126. What does a believer do when he sins out of weakness? A believer heartily bewails his past sins and prays to God for forgiveness.

127. Does then God forgive believers their sins? Yes; as long as a believer does not sin wilfully, he has forgiveness of God.

128. What should we do daily that we may not fall into wilful sins? We should daily watch and pray.

129. How does a believer watch? A believer watches over himself when he guards all his thoughts, actions, words and works.

130. What is prayer? Prayer is the communing of the heart with God.

131. Whereby now can we speak with God in heaven? We can speak with God through prayer.

132. How does God speak to us? God speaks to us through His Word.

133. What did the Lord Jesus teach us as a prayer? The Lord Jesus Himself taught us the Lord's Prayer.

134. Who can pray well-pleasing to God? Every believer, and even a pious child also, can pray well-pleasing to God.

135. For whom should we pray? We should pray for ourselves, for all believers, yes, for all men.

136. How should we pray? We should with all confidence pray in the name of Jesus, and be comforted, as dear children entreat their dear father.

137. For what should we pray? We should pray especially for spiritual, and also for bodily, blessings.

138. Where should we pray? We can and should pray everywhere.

139. When should we pray? We should pray always with the heart, but also at stated times orally.

140. Does God hear our prayer? Yes; when the just cry unto Him, the Lord hears them and delivers them out of all their trouble.

141. How can we pray always to God? We pray always when we are mindful of God in all our work.

142. What has Christ still further instituted for Christians for the strengthening of their faith? Christ instituted the Holy Supper for the strengthening of their faith.

143. What does the Lord Jesus give you in the Holy Supper? The Lord Jesus gives me His body and blood in the Holy Supper.

144. With what do you receive the body of Christ? I receive the body of Christ with the bread.

145. With what do you receive the blood of Christ? I receive the blood of Christ with the wine.

146. Who should go to the Holy Supper? Only a believer should go to the Holy Supper.

147. What must a believer who would go to the Holy Supper do? A believer must examine his life in which he will see that he has so often erred, pray to God for forgiveness, and amend his life.

148. Should then an ungodly person not go to the Holy Supper at all? An ungodly person can not go worthily to the Holy Supper until he repents.

149. Is it necessary that a believer should go often to the Holy Supper? A believer should go frequently to the Holy Supper that he may thereby continue steadfast in good works.

150. Does it always go well in this world with pious believers? No; believers must through much cross and tribulation enter into the kingdom of heaven.

151. How do believers fare among the ungodly? Believers are mocked and persecuted by the ungodly.

152. How should believers conduct themselves under every cross? Believers should patiently bear every cross, and love their enemies.

153. Against whom must believers daily strive? Believers must daily strive against the devil, the world, and their own flesh.

154. When will believers be delivered from every cross? Believers will be delivered from every cross at death.

155. What now is death to the believer? Death to the believer is a blessed death.

156. Where does the believer's soul go after death? The believer's soul goes to God in heaven.

157. Will the body remain dead in the grave? No; the bodies of believers will sometime be resurrected and glorified.

158. Who will resurrect the dead? Christ, on the last day, will resurrect all the dead.

159. Is also the death of the ungodly a blessed death? No; the death of the ungodly is an unblessed death, though in death he also has a gentle countenance.

160. But when an ungodly person diligently prays before his death and receives the Holy Supper, does he not then certainly die blessed? If an ungodly person does not heartily repent before his death, then neither external prayer nor the Holy Supper help him.

161. Will then also the ungodly arise on the last day? Yes; also all the ungodly will be resurrected.

162. Will each soul be then united to its body? Yes; the souls of the godly as well as the souls of the ungodly will be again united to their bodies.

163. What will take place on the last day? Christ will judge all men.

164. How will Christ invite believers, soul and body, into glory? "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

165. How will He banish the ungodly into everlasting damnation? "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

166. What will pass away with the last day? Heaven and earth will be dissolved by fire.

167. What will be the lot of man in eternity? The damned shall suffer everlasting pain in hell; but the elect shall see God and their Savior, and have everlasting joy.

168. What would you learn from this Christian doctrine? I will heartily entreat God to daily lead me to the better know the greatness of my sins, and the grace of Jesus Christ, and also to preserve me that I walk not with the wicked world and be condemned with it, but lead a life of daily repentance and faith.

169. What therefore is your comfort? When I live a life of repentance and faith, I am a child of God, have forgiveness of sin, die happy, and obtain everlasting life.

SEMI-CENTENNIAL OF "INNER MISSION WORK."

BY REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O

All Protestant Germany is uniting in celebrating the passing of the fiftieth milestone in the "Inner Mission" work of the Fatherland. This species of Christian activity, in the shape and extent which it has assumed in the land of Luther, is a unique product of German Christianity, that cannot exactly be paralleled in other lands. Elements and parts and portions of it exist, of course, elsewhere, and beginnings of it existed in Germany more than half a century ago;

but the real birthday of Inner Mission as an organized and national movement aiming at bringing under Christian influences the whole inner life of the nation, dates from the famous address, made by Johann Heinrich Wichern, at the Ecclesiastical Congress at Wittenberg, the town of Luther and Melanchthon and of the Reformation, held from September 21-23, 1848. This was a convention at which representatives of all Germany met, and at which great and serious problems were discussed, all questions of living Christianity which had come into the forefront through the revolutionary year 1848 and the deplorable moral and spiritual tendencies which the stirring events of the times had brought to the surface in the German masses. On this occasion Wichern, who now is known in the church history of Germany as "the Father of Inner Missions," and who was then already a man matured in the works of Christian charity and was best known as the head of the "*Rauhe House*," in Horn, near Hamburg, which from the small beginnings of an orphans' home had gradually grown to the dimensions of a great institution for charity and mercy, spoke with such force and zeal on the needs and methods of a re-Christianization of the masses in Germany, especially through works of love and charity on the halt, the lame and the blind, physically, morally, intellectually and spiritually, and with the fire of the Spirit demonstrated the manner and way in which organized work in this department would be the salvation of genuine and living Christianity, that he set Protestant Christianity in the Fatherland aflame, and the Wittenberg Convention proved to be the birthday of Inner Missions and the beginnings of a movement that has been the source of countless blessings to Germans everywhere.

It is somewhat difficult to define exactly what is understood in Germany by Inner Missions. Being a propaganda that has historically expanded externally and internally, it is scarcely capable of definition and can be understood only by an explanation. It is a good deal more than "Home Missions," as understood by the English speaking Christian world, and in one or two particulars perhaps a little less than Home Missions. The latter has in view chiefly and primarily the preaching of the Gospel to those within our own borders who are yet without the Word. It is a

synonym for Evangelization. Even the term "*Innere Mission*," as used by German Christians of this country, the Lutherans, the United Synod and others, is taken in the American sense. But Inner Mission in the Fatherland is not evangelization or preaching — at least not primarily — but is Christian charity in the widest sense of the term. Nor is it to be understood that Wichern himself organized the work as an entirely new propaganda. In not a few cases charitable projects of various kinds already existing have in the course of time been incorporated in this general scheme, e. g. the revival of the Apostolic Deaconess Order by Fliedner, of Kaiserswerth, antedates the organization of Inner Mission Work on a national scale by a dozen years, although it was enlarged in scope by Wichern through the addition of the male deacon order, now too so flourishing among German Christians.

Probably a fair idea of the scope of Inner Mission can be gained by a glance at the excellent Handbook on the subject, entitled "*Die Innere Mission in der Schule*" (a companion volume to the "*Aeuszere Mission in der Schule*," by Warneck), written by the chief exponent of the Inner Mission cause, the Wichern of to-day, Pastor Theodore Schäfer, the head of the Deaconess Institute at Altona, near Hamburg. He states that it is the purpose of the Inner Mission cause to do the works of Christian charity, first for the family; secondly, for the Church; and, thirdly, for the State. In describing the work under each of these three leading heads he subdivides the first as follows, thereby designating the project actually in operation now by the Inner Mission workers of all kinds:

- 1) Crèches, or places where small children are taken care of while their mothers are at work;
- 2) School for Small Children ("*Klein-Kinderschule*"), for somewhat older children, in which the beginnings of an education are given but informally;
- 3) *Kinderhort*, or schools for children of an age in which they should attend school, but whose parents are both compelled to leave home for labor;
- 4) Homes for Journeymen and Societies for Journeymen;
- 5) Homes for workingmen who may be abroad seeking for employment;
- 6) Young Peoples' Societies;
- 7) Martha Homes, places to serve as a home for working girls out of employment;

8) Workingmen's colonies, or places where the wandering tramp is sure to be able to secure work and a Christian home if he deserves these. Of these magnificent enterprises there are fully a dozen scattered throughout Germany and have to a great extent solved the tramp problem. 9) Asylums for drinkers who are anxious to reform. 10) Magdalen. Institutes, or homes for fallen girls who are desirous of amending their ways.

The second grand division of Inner Missions seeks to aid the Church in its work, and is subdivided as follows: 1) Care of the Diaspora, or German Christians scattered throughout foreign lands, supplying them with pastors, churches, etc.; 2) Providing spiritually for the wandering classes among the various grades of working men, i. e. those who at certain seasons seek work of special kinds at various localities and thus have no permanent church home; 3) Emigrant Missions, at Hamburg, Bremen, etc.; 4) Seamen's Missions; 5) City Missions, a source of great blessing to thousands, particularly in Berlin, where under the patronage of the Emperor and the Empress this work has flourished phenomenally; 6) Care of neglected members within the congregations, i. e. the sick, the poor, etc.; 7) Movement to effect a proper observation of the Lord's Day; 8) Sunday-schools; 9) Bible Societies; 10) Colportage of good Christian Literature; 11) Sunday papers (which in Germany always means *Christian* papers, thus materially differing from the American idea of what a "Sunday" paper unfortunately is); 12) Popular Libraries.

The third grand division aims to assist the State. Its subdivisions are these: 1) Care of the former prisoners, securing work for them and the opportunity of permanent reform; 2) Orphans' Homes; 3) Houses of Refuge, especially for those physically wrecked, e. g. epileptics, idiots, etc.; 4) Training Institutes for Inner Mission Workers; 5) Hospitals of various kinds and character; 6) Care of the sick during war times and during epidemics; 7) Care of the Poor.

Each of these departments has a history and an honorable record of its own, for which complete statistics are not readily accessible. The best that can be furnished in this line is found in Schneider's *Theologisches Jahrbuch* for 1898—

the twenty-fifth issue of this excellent annual of German Christianity and its work — where from page 273 to 326 there is found a comparatively complete account of what has been done in all these lines of Christian enterprise by the Christians of the Fatherland. The account is from the pen of Court Preacher Schneider, of Koesfeld (*not* the editor of the book). In several of these spheres Germany has accomplished remarkable things. Notably is this the case in City Missions, in Workingmen's colonies, and in the Deaconess cause. In the 44 German Motherhouses connected with Kaiserswerth, and the 24 foreign houses, no fewer than 12,300 deaconesses are engaged, while there are some 1700 not connected with Kaiserswerth, making a grand total of 15,000 Christian women under German Protestant auspices devoting their lives to Christian charity work, falling but little short of the 22,000 sisters of the Catholic Church in the Fatherland. In other lines almost equally good results can be reported. The work is spreading rapidly and is very popular throughout the Church and the State, being the strongest appeal that can be offered to the churchless masses for the claims of Christianity. The chief centre of the work is now doubtless Bielefeld, where Pastor von Bodelschwingh, a master organizer, beginning with practically nothing, has established something like twenty different institutions and manages to secure, without any endowment funds whatever, an annual income of two million marks for his enterprises. His work has recently secured the warm endorsement of the Emperor, who together with the Empress spent several days visiting the institutions. The whole propaganda of Inner Missions is a living testimonial of the activity and zeal of German Christianity, who every day are increasing their faith not only in the *ora* but also in the *labora*, and by their enterprise in this direction have shown that they are not only thinkers and writers, but also workers. The semi-centennial of Inner Mission work deserves recognition and commendation of Christians in every land and clime.

OUR BOOK CONCERN.

BY REV. PROF. M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, O.

Among the agencies instituted by the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Ohio for the prosecution of its work and attainment of its ends our Book Concern occupies a conspicuous place, and it has accordingly elicited a large share of attention. That under the circumstances its management would escape criticism, it is not reasonable to expect. The interest taken in the work will sometimes find vent in censure as well as in praise. It is exposing no secret when we say that to many our Book Concern, notwithstanding the large proportions into which it has grown and the excellent facilities which it has acquired for its work, has been a disappointment.

We are not disposed to join those who, viewing the Concern as a new business venture and testing its success by its profits in dollars and cents, have not a good word to say in its behalf. No doubt there is room for dissatisfaction on this ground, and the comparison made with our day of small things when we had no such great Book Concern, but from our modest publishing efforts reaped some pecuniary profits by which other branches of our work were aided, is not wholly unjustifiable. But those who regard the matter only from that point of view should consider that if a business is to grow large and become largely remunerative its profits in its earlier stages are requisite for its own equipment and extension, and cannot safely be appropriated to other purposes. Perhaps more has been expected in this respect than the conditions warranted.

It is true, on the other hand, that even those whose chief interest in our Book Concern centers in their conception of it as a money-making institution, are not always unreasonable when they express disappointment at the results so far attained. When business men shake their heads dubiously or even disapprovingly on reading the figures presented in the reports, it is not fair to attribute this to an unkind and fault-finding spirit. There is reason for the inquiry, whether it is wise to push the Concern into great-

ness beyond its means, and whether such a large establishment should not produce larger profits.

From this business point of view the subject has recently been pretty thoroughly ventilated and provision has been made for improvement.

But there is another side to the question which concerns us more, and which, in our estimation, ought to concern the Ohio Synod more, than the mere matter of business transactions and pecuniary profits. Let us not overlook the fact that our Book Concern was designed to serve the Church in the pursuit of its legitimate object and in the performance of its legitimate work. The high commission of the Church is to preach the gospel of salvation in Christ to all nations. It does this by voice and pen, by pulpit and press. A printing house that ministers to the earthly wants of men is rendering good service in the world; it is engaged in legitimate secular business: but it is not doing church work. A furniture factory renders important service to mankind; it is a legitimate secular business. But the Ohio Synod would hardly think of establishing and conducting such a business, however profitable it might be. What it desires is to publish to the people the glad tidings of good things revealed in Holy Scripture, and the better to do this through the press it wants a publishing house of its own. That is the purport of our Book Concern.

This does not imply that when expensive machinery is purchased and all equipments are furnished to do its work well, no service should be rendered to others who can reap benefits from our appointments and skill, and who are willing to pay for the advantages offered and the benefits received. So far as this can be done without interfering with the legitimate purpose and proper work of the church institution, it should certainly be done; and if the house can be made not only self-sustaining, but yield assistance to other departments of church work that are not, we should rejoice in the blessing.

But it is just in this line that our danger lies. When, at no small cost and risk, everything is supplied for doing good work that can compete with that of the best secular establishments, those who are capable at all of managing large business interests will necessarily direct their atten-

tion in large measure to the question of pay and profit. They think of the money invested and the possibilities of loss and ultimate failure. No one can blame them for that; indeed, there are few that would not censure them, most would even bitterly censure them, if such a calamity came. Even those who have a most hearty interest in the great work of the Church can not, in the management of a church institution that involves a large amount of money, feel easy when the business is imperilled. The temptation is very great to accept only such work as will pay. But most readers need not be told that the printing and binding that pays best is not that which the Church most needs for the accomplishment of its glorious purposes, that look beyond this world and its pay and pecuniary profit. Those who have the calling to direct our publication interests should make earnest account of these things, lest that be lost sight of entirely which the church had in view in the establishment of our Book Concern.

And not only does the danger stare us in the face that our institution for publishing the gospel through the press be diverted entirely from its purpose and become a mere secular business house. Even if this calamity be avoided, there is still a strong temptation, while the calling of a church institution to do the work of the church is fully conceded, to permit the secular element to become predominant. Some of our most important publications yield no pecuniary profit: shall they on that account be discontinued or curtailed? If, in the spiritual power which they put forth and the service which they render in the accomplishment of the church's calling, they are not worth the money invested, the question must be answered in the affirmative. Let them die, if they are unprofitable servants. But as a Lutheran Christian we enter our earnest and solemn protest against making the income of dollars and cents the criterion of profit. If they are doing more good than the Book Concern can ever do in making money, let them live and go on with their glorious work, assured that the Lord will provide for that which is pleasing in His sight and serves to execute His great commission. Let not worldly

considerations thwart the purpose of our publication house.

We do not doubt that those who have the management of our Book Concern have many a hard problem to solve. Even when they keep its proper object steadily in view, the question of pecuniary gain will ever be struggling to the surface, and this all the more because it has a reasonable claim to consideration. The publication that pays seems preferable to the publication that does not pay; and from this it is an easy step to the other thought, that the printing which pays, whoever may order it and whatever may be its import, is preferable to a church publication that does not pay. Error works with subtlety and is calculated to mislead. If two tracts or two books are presented, one of which will sell and not only cover all expenses, but yield some profit, while the other will not, reason would dictate that, all other things being equal, the choice should fall upon that which is remunerative; and by parity of reasoning, the remunerative work that is offered to the house should have the preference over all other work that is not remunerative. That, as the world generally understands it, would be conducting the business on business principles. But all other things are not equal. The whole view, and all argument founded on that view, are radically wrong. The church institution has church work to do, and only to this does it owe its existence. If it fails in this, it is a failure, whatever the world may say of its success. If the publication that will pay is one that the church does not read and cares nothing about, while the one that is needed and will be a help in executing her great commission cannot be expected to yield pecuniary profit, but would be issued only at a probable loss, how then? The former can easily find a publisher, and the offices of the church are not needed to supply the demand; the latter does not commend itself to secular publication houses, because there is no money in it, and that to business men is a primary consideration. Christian people want to preach the gospel through the press. The Ohio Synod established its Book Concern for this purpose, knowing very well that it had no calling to supply wants for which the world always makes ample provision, but knowing just as well that the

world makes and can make no provision for doing her work.

We cannot stop here. As we understand the design of the Church a wrong has been done when the idea is entertained of establishing a church institution for the purpose of making money; and the wrong is continued as long as a church institution is conducted on that principle. Raising grain and cattle, manufacturing the articles which supply man's natural wants, trade and commerce, are all legitimate callings in which Christians can, according to God's ordinance, serve their fellowmen. They are divine callings in the order of Providence, whether men are Christians or not, and they are Christian callings in the sense that when a man by grace becomes a Christian he does all his work, not excepting that in the sphere of nature, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and serves his blessed Lord in his temporal as well as in his spiritual calling. But the confusion is palpable when, on that account, the temporal calling is supposed to be spiritual. A good butcher or baker is not for that reason a good Christian. Even an infidel may furnish good meat and good bread, and be an infidel for all that. The housefather must provide for his family, and he sins if he does not mind his business, on which such provision under the providence of God depends. But when he minds his business, he is not on that account a child of God. A man may work hard and make money without being a believer in Christ and a blessed heir of heaven. The Church has nothing to do with these temporal callings except to preach the Word that sanctifies them, so that its members may do in the service of Christ what others do in the service of mammon, and what all do, whether they serve God or mammon, in the order of nature. The Church was not established to cultivate farms and run mills, to provide butcher-shops and bakeries, clothing houses and groceries, printing offices and binderies. Such things nature and reason provide for. The Church is the kingdom of grace and its glorious commission is to administer the divinely instituted means by which the grace of God in Christ is brought to men for their salvation. It has nothing to do with the temporal callings of men in the order of nature and providence, except to administer the grace which re-

generates men, that they may do all in the name of the Lord Jesus and give thanks to God and the Father by Him.

Least of all has the Church anything to do with money-making. Even the temporal callings of men are pursued in a wrong spirit when their object is simply pecuniary profit. When the grace of God exerts its sanctifying power in the souls of men, they see that they have something nobler to do than to make money. Their life becomes a service of God in the service of their neighbor, and they raise grain and make flour and manufacture clothing and sell goods primarily because that is the will of God, in pursuance of which important service is rendered to their fellowmen. It is not the Christian view to regard the profits of temporal callings as the principal thing. The command given us that we should provide for our households is by no means designed to inculcate the notion, that all depends on our providing. That is a heathenish thought. God provides. And He provides for the ungodly as well as for the righteous, else not a soul would live on earth. The utmost that we can do is to be workers together with Him, subjecting ourselves to the order which He has made for the government of the world, and doing what He has capacitated us to do. Whether we know it or do not know it, whether we recognize it or do not recognize it, He gives us our daily bread, and we have this only because His loving kindness gives it, not because our labor has merited it or coerced its bestowal. Those who think that their wisdom and work in money-making secures their livelihood, are all astray: if God does not provide for us we shall starve, in spite of all our ingenuity and energy. The Christian is faithfully to do the work of His calling, in obedience to the Lord's will, and, casting his cares upon Him, let the Lord provide. As soon as he sets out in quest of wealth, as if that could render him independent, he is on the way to perdition. The Church errs grievously when it sanctions such unbelieving thoughts, and when it itself enters upon schemes and projects that have gain for their object, as if that were godliness.

The Church needs money to carry on its noble work. This plain truth should not be withheld from its members.

On the contrary, it should be impressed on them. It is the Lord's will that those who have experienced the blessedness of the gospel should carry it to all nations, that all men may experience the blessedness which is designed for all. It costs money to do this, and those professing Christians who try to draw men to the church by telling them that it costs nothing, lack light, or lack faith, or lack wisdom. It manifestly does cost something, and those who are drawn to the church on the plea that it is a cheap business would better remain without until they are better informed. The Lord's will is that those who have received the grace of the gospel should bear it to all nations. Not all can go, but all can join in sending others. These must be educated and supported, and that costs something. It requires money to maintain educational institutions and send out missionaries, as it requires money to build churches and support pastors. Those who do not want the Lord to rule over their purses as well as their hearts would better not enter the church, or take their leave if they have entered. The reason is plain. The Lord has given no other instructions to His disciples than that they should do the church's work and pay the cost. They must do the work, or employ others to do it at their expense. There is no other divine rule in regard to paying the costs of church work but that of freely giving the money.

Hence all expedients for raising money, that are designed to evade the plain duty of being cheerful givers to carry on the work of the Church, are mere devices of men to escape the divine ordinance of giving. Not only the schemes that pander to the natural desire for pleasure, but also those which aim at the gratification of the carnal desire for money, are of this world, and not of the kingdom which is not of this world. The question as to the design and purpose of the church is not only whether God instituted it to furnish peanuts and candies for the children, that multitudes of them may thus be drawn into it instead of wandering about the streets in quest of gratification; to furnish ice cream and strawberries for young folks, with all the accompanying social enticements, that young men and maidens may go to church-festivals and find there what their nature craves, instead of going to secular saloons; to

furnish musical and literary and scientific entertainments for minds of a more artistic and cultured taste, instead of letting them seek the gratification of their natural desires in concerts and lectures that are regarded as worldly because the proceeds go into the world's, and not into the church's pocket. It reaches further than to the mere matter of amusements and recreations. The question is also whether the Lord instituted the Church to supply men's want of meat and drink and clothing and bedding. People want the necessities of life for body and soul, and they want recreation for body and soul. The nature of man needs them and will have them. Is the Church of Christ instituted to supply them? If the Church in our day had not drifted so far from its legitimate calling, which plainly is to administer the means of grace for the salvation of souls, who are all lost by nature and can be rescued only by the good tidings of redemption in Christ Jesus, it would be offensive even to ask such a question. The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, recreation and merriment; and a good time with ice cream and strawberries no more serves its purpose than a good time with Lager and Limburger. Both are natural methods of gratifying natural tastes; neither has anything to do with the salvation of the soul, except so far as there may be sin in the measure of gratification; and with that exception the Church has no calling and no duty in the matter. Its commission is to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, thus saving lost souls from the doom that is upon them. For temporal wants nature is sufficient; for the wants of the souls that sin has cursed nothing is of any avail but the grace of God. What a pity that the Church does not mind its own business and devote all its strength to the fulfilment of its high commission, instead of frittering away its strength in matters that nature can attend to very well, and never fails to attend to amply! By such mistaken zeal it only succeeds in mixing church and world, to the great detriment of the former. All efforts to build up the church by means which the world employs for its purposes are vain. They can accomplish absolutely nothing in the kingdom which is of this world. The Church has no calling to supply men's material wants by entering into the arena where

business men pursue their vocations and wage their wars, not even for the purpose of making money which is necessary to carry on its proper work. According to the divine will money-making is not to be the ultimate purpose of legitimate secular business, and the Church has not the calling to pursue secular business at all, much less to degrade it into a money-making scheme. It has its own legitimate work to do, which brings the grace of God to men without money and without price; and when it needs money, as it certainly does to carry on that work on earth, where the laborers must have meat and drink and raiment, God has taught His people no way to supply it but that of giving it as God has prospered them. That is the Lord's way: He loveth a cheerful giver.

We are not unaware of the confusion existing in many minds on this subject, and of the answers so often made in such confusion to the principle here set forth. Even with an air of triumph it is sometimes asked: How is the necessary money to be given if the people do not have it? And how are they to have it if it is not lawful to make it? And if church-members are permitted, nay required to engage in secular pursuits that they may have it to give, is that not conceding that the church may engage in secular pursuits and make its own money? If the members of the church may rightfully do it, may not the church rightfully do it — nay, is not the Church doing it in fact when its members do it? If brethren will reflect a little the fallacy of such argumentation will become apparent. God prospers the labors of His people's hands, so that as a fruit of their industry they have money to give for doing the Church's work. He assigns to men their temporal calling and blesses their diligence in performing its duties. But when Christians engage in such callings and are by the goodness of God prospered in them, it does not follow that these are the calling of the Church and that if it diligently engages in them it will have enough and to spare. The work which the farmer and the miller and the grocer do — the business which is carried on by the mechanic and manufacturer and merchant — is not the work of the Church because those who do it are church-members. It belongs to the order of nature, not to the order of grace, and the

Church has nothing at all to do with it but to sanctify the workmen, not that they may have intelligence to qualify them for such temporal vocations, but that they may have grace to do all in Jesus' name, and therefore not seek to be rich, but strive to be faithful, trusting always in God for their daily bread and such a measure of prosperity as seemeth to Him good. The Church has other work to do than that for which God has amply provided in His creative plan. It has no calling for trade and commerce, though its members have such temporal callings. Its grand commission is to ply the means of grace for the salvation of men and the glory of God; and the money which it needs in the pursuit of this calling or work, whether in employing men or building churches and institutions, Christians should cheerfully give from the proceeds of God's blessing on their labors in their temporal calling. So far as it allows itself to be diverted from the glorious charge committed to it and engages in secular business, it fails in faithfulness and becomes a busy-body in other men's matters.

If our Book Concern is to be a legitimate institution of the Church, it is essential that it do the work which God has committed to the Church, and that it steadily pursue the aim of glorifying the Savior by publishing His truth unto salvation, whether it makes money or not. We trust we are not mistaken when we say that if it is to be conducted primarily in the interest of money-making it is not what our most devoted people want. That it is money-making for the benefit of the Church does not conciliate them. It never was the design of the Lord that it should make its own money and dispense with dependence on the cheerful giving of His people for its support. Our effort must be to convert more souls to the Savior, who will then gladly engage in the church's work, not to get more people and more money, whether souls are saved or not. Any scheme or contrivance of the church to get gold, without reference to its legitimate calling to preach the gospel, is an abuse; and all church work looking to profit, other than that of making cheerful givers by turning hearts to the Lord, we cannot but regard as work of the flesh that may promise much but performs nothing. The worldliness that resorts to such methods vitiates all the work for which it pays, and

helps to undermine all sincere efforts of believers to build up a kingdom that is not of this world.

Our Book Concern was designed to be an auxiliary to the ministry of the church, and to do work for Christ in the same sense as missions are designed to do such work. Christians generally have not yet come to think that missions, by the purchase of lands and the establishment of factories and other requirements of civilization, must be self-sustaining and even yield some profits for home work. It may, if present erring schemes of thought are not arrested, come to that in course of time. So far, by the grace of God, it has been admitted that the work of evangelizing the world is to be done, though it costs something. Believers are always glad to give for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. They want to save others from the present evil and the eternal horrors of sin, as by the grace of God they have themselves been saved. If the members of our congregations have no such desire, and shrink from the work that costs them something, all the more should our pastors teach and preach and exhort and admonish, instead of slighting their glorious calling and wasting their precious time by prosecuting schemes that make money for the church, but save no souls, and even place hindrances in the way of salvation by secularizing the Church. They will accomplish much by plying the means of grace, preaching the Word to young and old, in season and out of season, whether these will hear or forbear; they will accomplish nothing when they call all the powers of nature into exercise and shrewdly harness them all to pull the external church along, though they draw large crowds, get an abundance of money, erect magnificent churches, and build up a glorious — well, a glorious kingdom that is altogether of this world! True Christians want to build a kingdom that is not of this world and that furnishes eternal happiness at God's right hand. And those who are intelligent and sincere laborers in this kingdom, as the grace of God has established it in the Ohio Synod, want the Book Concern of that synod to serve the glorious purpose of preaching the Word through the press, as its ministers preach it from the pulpit. If it is to do just what will pay, many a Christian heart will be saddened, and will decline any re-

sponsibility in the matter, as many are constrained to decline any responsibility, and therefore enter their protest, when in congregations the wisdom of man and the ways of man are substituted for the ways of God. The wisdom of man, as against the wisdom of God, is consummate foolishness. No doubt more money can be made by printing and publishing what the world wants than by printing what the Church needs; and no doubt more money can be made by printing and publishing what satisfies the religious desires of the community generally than by supplying the wants of the Lutheran Church in particular. That is so evident that it need not be urged at all before men of intelligence. We at any rate have never had the least doubt that a circus performance would pay better than a sermon, although we have never admitted that a circus performance would accomplish for the happiness of men in this world, and for their everlasting happiness, what a good sermon would. That which satisfies the flesh can always be counted on as more popular, and therefore more likely to pay, than anything which ministers to man's spiritual necessities, which are generally not recognized and therefore not realized. It is hardly a debatable question whether a good novel would not pay better than a good Lutheran commentary. Accordingly we admit from the secular point of view, the force of the argument in favor of the world as against the work of the Church, and are not at all disposed to deny that, assuming that money-making is the purpose, Lutheran aims and objects have no chance. But we do not at all admit the miserable assumption underlying the argument. The Church was never instituted to make money. It is not at all needed in the world for that purpose. Nature can attend to that and does attend to it to nauseation. The Church needs money, but so long as it adheres to the Lord's Word it knows, and can know, no other way of getting it but that of dispensing the grace which makes cheerful givers. Our Book Concern must preach the gospel through the press: if it can be self-sustaining while it does this, and even yield some profit which may be devoted to other forms of preaching the gospel, we should thank God on this behalf; but if it is to do the work of the Church it must preach the gospel, and is a total failure as a church

institution when it neglects this work and, adopting money-making as its' object, regulates all its plans and undertakings by the world's standard of profit.

The press has become a power in the earth, and the Church does well to use this instrumentality in advancing its cause. The writer has never wavered in his conviction that the Ohio Synod did a wise thing in establishing a press of its own, just as it did a wise thing in establishing educational institutions of its own. It has a glorious gospel to teach and to preach, and it does the dear Redeemer's will when it proclaims that gospel through the living voice and through the printing press. *Our Book Concern* may become a power in the land. But to be this it must not waver in its purpose to do the work of the Church, and to live and labor for this end, to which everything else must be subordinate and tributary. It belongs to the Church; let it do what the Lord wants the Church to do, and He will bless it in its deeds, and make it an efficient instrumentality in spreading the good confession which was witnessed at Augsburg, and in making glad the hearts of the people whom Christ has redeemed.

If congregations should even regard their pulpits as money-making agencies, with the preaching of the gospel as secondary however relatively important, the symptoms of their approaching dissolution as churches are plain to every discerning mind. Nothing can help them but the grace of God, which requires the abandonment of their evil ways. The pastor who is called with the understanding that he shall fill the church and thus put money into the church's purse, is a pitiful preacher. He must be a trimmer, or he will lose his vocation. That is an inexpressibly sorrowful situation, except to one who has no faith in the Word and in the Christ whom that Word proclaims. Lutherans want no such preachers, because they do want Christ and the salvation which He alone supplies. They want the gospel, and they want pastors who will preach it for the salvation and consolation of men, even though many should despise it and refuse to contribute their money to support it. Woe to the pulpit that degrades itself into a money-making concern! However admirable it may be in the sight of a penurious congregation, that would rather

substitute popular human opinions for the saving, though humiliating truth of the Bible, than to have Christ preached as an offence to the carnal crowd, to the Lord the whole ungodly thing is an abomination. The Church lives and prospers by the grace of God, not by the schemes and devices of men, though these — to the shame of Christians be it spoken, if it is true at all — may put more money into its purse. Man lives not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

Because our Book Concern is a church institution and as such can have no calling and no right in the world except so far as it serves the kingdom of God which is not of this world, it has and can have no privileges, so far as its purposes and aims are concerned, which do not belong equally to the pulpit. There is a difference which all who think will readily admit. But this difference is entirely misconceived when it is assumed that the pulpit serves the church by preaching the gospel and the press serves the church by making money for its work. The press may render such service to the church, just as a bakery or grocery may render such service; but the one is no more on that account a church institution than the other. The pulpit needs money to do its work as well as the press; and those who preach the gospel have a right to expect their support from those whom they serve, as well as those who publish books which proclaim the same truth unto salvation. "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." 1 Cor. 13. 14. No intelligent man expects another to devote himself to a work of love in which he is permitted to starve, and which could therefore at best be but of short duration and of small achievement. Those who receive the benefits of gospel preaching must at least so far appreciate the blessing as to enable the preacher to live and continue his beneficent work. "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter that we have reaped your carnal things?" 1 Cor. 9, 10. Those who will pay nothing are welcome to hear the gospel in our churches without money and without price. Spiritual

things are not in the market for money. They are always and absolutely free: whosoever will may come and drink of the waters of life. But when a soul realizes the blessing bestowed, cheerful giving is invariably the result. Money is needed to sustain the pulpit as well as the press which works in the same cause. The difference does not lie in that. It lies in the public that is addressed. The minister of the church preaches to an organized congregation to whose service he is called and by which he is supported, and all are welcome to attend his public ministrations, because the good tidings which he proclaims are, in the design of God, for all people. But this is necessarily limited by the capacity of the building in which the services of the congregation are held. It is not so with the press. This has a larger public, which cannot be controlled by congregations and synods. When a sermon is preached, all who can gain access to the building are cheerfully admitted. The ministry is pecuniarily provided for by the congregation, and all are welcome to its services. But when a book is published by the church, the case is different. The audience addressed is the whole world. No church, in the nature of things, can make provision for bidding welcome without money and without price to such an audience. Nor would it be right, even if it were possible. Christians are not only not called, but they are expressly forbidden to cast their pearls before swine. There must therefore be some discrimination. We cannot put out our books for free distribution among millions. Those who want them are welcome to them, but must, if they are able, be expected to pay for them, as those who want the preaching of the gospel by the living voice are, if they are able, expected to pay, according as the Lord has prospered them, towards the support of the preacher. But it is manifest from the analogy that, as the gospel is preached to many who pay nothing, either because they are not able to pay, or because they have not yet appreciated the blessedness of the gospel and are therefore not willing to pay, as in the publication of books and booklets and tracts, provision should be made for free distribution by Christian charity within the limits of Christian prudence.

Our contention is simply this, that church institutions must serve the church, and that so far as they fail to do this they are failures. We have a deep conviction that in these days the press has a high office to fulfill. Those who will not use it are neglecting one of the mightiest of modern instrumentalities, and they must suffer the consequences of their error. Let us keep up with the times in all that faith in God's precious Word can recognize and utilize. But let us not succumb to the theories of the flesh, which imagines that there is no need of grace, and that human nature is amply sufficient to supply all human wants. Modern science is no help to deliver our race from the evil of sin and the death that is its inevitable result. Our hope is in the grace of God which the Church possesses and which she is called to minister. She has no calling else. Our Book Concern was designed as a servant in this glorious cause. Let us labor and pray that it may not be diverted from its high calling to mere worldly uses of money-making; but become a great spiritual power for declaring the truth in Jesus.

NOTES.

NEW BIBLICAL FIND. — Egypt has again furnished an important addition to Biblical literature in the shape of several valuable extracts from the famous Greek translation of the Old Testament, made by Aquilas of Pontus, the pupil of the famous Rabbi Akiba. This version was made for the special purpose of crowding out the Septuagint which the Christians of the first centuries had begun to employ against the Jews in theological discussions. The Aquila translation is intensely, even pedantically literal, rendering even the Hebrew sign of the accusative case. Every particle is translated. It was one of the fruits of the extreme verbal inspiration theory of the Akiba school of theology. Hitherto this version was known only through the references of Origen and Jerome, but no specimens of any length were known to exist. This desideratum has now been supplied by the discovery of a palimpsest in the *geniza* of the old Jewish Synagogue in Cairo, made by Dr. Schlechter, of the

University of Cambridge, and brought by him to England. The *Christian World*, of London, describes in detail this new literary find. The upper writing on the document is a Hebriliturgical work, dating from the Middle Ages, while the lower, dating from the fifth or sixth centuries, contains in Uncial letters two extracts from the Aquila translation, namely 1 Kings 20, 7-17, and 2 Kings 23, 11-27. The fact that this is an extract from this famous version was really first discovered by Mr. Burkitt, known from his connection with the Syriac gospel finds in the Mt. Sinai cloister. The extracts, while comparatively meagre, are sufficiently lengthy for identification as a part of the Aquila version. One of the peculiarities is the method of writing the name of Jehovah, the *tetrogrammaton*, which is found ten times in these extracts. Aquila neither translated nor transcribed the word, but simply left it as found in the unprinted Hebrew text, which, according to Origen was the custom of the Jews, and which is also found on old Jewish coin and in the Siloam inscription. The name was however always read as if written *Κύριος*. This is the first instance of the kind found in a written document.

SOCIETIES. — The two great rival communions, the Protestants and the Catholics, in Germany have both large organizations to provide for the spiritual wants of their brethren in territories where their coreligionists constitute the ministry. The Protestant Society is called the Gustavus Adolphus Association and has recently held its annual convention in Dessau. It there reported 1,849 branch societies and 538 women's societies, an increase of 17 of the former kind and 12 of the latter. The income for the year had been 2,056,153 marks, or an increase of 351,346; and the expenses had been 1,212,912 marks. During the year 50 churches and chapels had been completed, 53 congregations had become independent of the society's financial support, and 54 new organizations were effected. In all 1,738 congregations are supported by the Association. In the Gustavus Adolphus Association all the Protestants of Germany stand together and present an undivided phalanx. Only the ultra conservatives among the Lutherans have

their own. "Gotteskasten" for their Diaspora work and do not coöperate in the Association's plans and labors. The "Gotteskasten" during the past twelvemonths reported an income of 10,877 marks, which is a decrease compared with the year before. The great Roman Catholic rival society, which takes care of Catholic interests in predominantly Protestant sections, was organized only ten years ago, and is nearly half a century younger than the Protestant society. Yet financially it has outstripped the latter. During the year 1895 its income has been 3,073,579 marks, or an increase of 700,000 marks over the year 1894. It supports 705 mission stations with 1,160,166 marks. During its comparatively short career it has expended for the Catholic cause in Protestant neighborhoods no less than 21,000,000 marks. The state or church authorities aid neither of these enterprises; they are altogether the result of private enterprise and coöperation.

PSEUDO-FIND. — Some weeks ago, the Italian savant, Professor Marruchi, published an account of an archæological find made in the palace of Tiberius, on the Palatine, and seemingly representing a caricature of the crucifixion of Christ in rough pencil sketch. Although he expressed his surmise as to the purpose of the picture with great hesitancy, the recognized standing of Marruchi as an archæologist caused the report to be widely published that a companion caricature and parallel picture to the famous mock-crucifix on the Paletinus had been discovered. Opposition to this view at once made its appearance, and Marruchi has now, before his critics could attack him, announced that he no longer accepts the opinion which he had published originally only as a surmise. The find was recently discussed at length in the Society of Christian Archæology in Rome. Apparently the matter is now laid *ad acta*.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XVIII.

DECEMBER, 1898.

No. 6.

THE BIBLE OF THE OLD AND THE BIBLE OF THE NEW THEOLOGY.

BY REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

That the Bible is being studied by the present generation of theologians is evident from many facts. In the whole field of theological research no department, with the possible exception of the historical, produces a mass of literature that can compare with the output of the Biblical field. Nor has there been in any other department such a change in ideas and ideals and such a divergency of trends and tendencies as in this same line of investigation. Here again the only department that can be placed by the side of the Biblical, in the last decade or two, is the historical; but both in the multitude of literary production as also in the new departures and new divisions that characterize the historical theology of the day are there the fundamental principles involved or the vastness, divergency of methods and results to be taken into consideration that play such a prominent role in Biblical researches. Then, too, the methods and manners, both old and new, in historical research are of importance, not so much for themselves, as relatively the historical branches can scarcely be placed on a parallel with the Biblical or dogmatical or even practical branches; but their chief importance lies in their bearings on the Bible research current in our times.

The present method generally accepted by the representatives of the modern school of Bible research is the historico-critical, or a critical adaptation of the methods

of historical investigation utilized for the investigation of the origin, character, contents and history of the Biblical books. In this union of historical and Biblical studies is found the real cause and reason for the more or less radically new conception which in current criticism is held of the Biblical books and their contents. There can be no doubt about the fact that the Bible is no longer regarded in the same light in which it was looked upon by former generations of theologians and investigators, who still adhered to the belief in a verbal inspiration, absolute inerrancy and reliability of the one and undivided truth of the Scriptures as the infallible word of God given through the inspiration of the Prophets and the Apostles. The historical research of our day, as in fact all learned investigation, is controlled by the idea of development, a thought, which in its various applications and uses has become a source of the greatest good and the greatest harm to science in general and to theological science in particular. We are living in the age of Darwinian thought, according to which that which is, is a product of that which was by natural processes and laws, normally and naturally developed without any special impetus or influence from extraneous causes. The current scientific ideals are antagonistic to anything but natural development; and while Darwin applied this principle himself only to the phenomena of nature and to the construction of a new natural philosophy, others have applied it to other departments; and this application has been made, neither last nor least, to the theological and Biblical studies, so that here too, to use a word of the late lamented Delitzsch, it is the aim of current criticism to develop "a religion of the Era of Darwin," i. e. a religion which in its origin, development and positive teachings is the outcome of natural causes and laws, the natural unfolding of the Semitic type of mind as represented by the Jewish peoples, who by their natural endowments were better adapted to develop a higher kind of religious teachings than other peoples, just as by natural endowment the Greeks were the superiors of other nations in philosophical and æsthetic thought and the Romans in practical government and the administration of law and justice. Such ideals are in the air in the subjects of philosophical thought of the day, and their adaptation

to the problems, theoretical and practical, of religion is the project of the Wellhausen school in the Old Testament department and kindred tendencies in the New.

What an entirely different book the Bible must become under the spell of such a subjective and preconceived notion as to what the religious scheme must be that it contains, is readily imagined and still more clearly seen by a reference to the leading works of the critical research of our times. There can be no denial of the fact that the application of the historical method in itself to the interpretation of the facts of the Scriptures has been productive of good and has aided Bible study to a certain extent. The Bible is in its chief parts not a thetical statement of abstract and doctrinal or ethical truths, but rather the historical unfolding of the plans of God for the reëstablishment of fallen mankind, and as such is history and that too a gradual unfolding in the course of many centuries. God revealed His plans and did His work in direct connection with the ups and downs of His chosen people and as such, not only the historical records but also the thetical and direct teachings of the Scripture, cannot but in the nature of the case become all the clearer when understood and studied in the light of the historic surroundings that may have called them forth. No doubt it is to be regretted that in so many cases, especially in the Psalms and the Prophets, we are not acquainted with the historical surroundings presupposed by some of these hymns and visions; for if we knew the special occasion that prompted these utterances we would be able all the better to penetrate the meaning of the seer and the singer of God. In other cases, where this historical background has in late years been becoming more and more clear, on account of our becoming better acquainted with new sources that throw light on it, as e. g. the teachings of New Testament Judaism with its doctrine of justification by the works of the law, such new information has at least in part made all the clearer the teachings of the Apostle Paul which he sets up against this erroneous tenet in his determined advocacy of the doctrine of justification by faith alone. At any rate, by this method it becomes all the more apparent why the Apostle, as also Christ Himself, was compelled, as it were, to teach in the manner he did, and to

present the truths of the Gospel in the form in which it is contained in the apostolic presentation of the New Testament preaching and New Testament literature. There has been a positive gain made by the historical method of studying the Scriptures, even over against the Biblical research of other generations, so that in certain respects we understand portions and parts of the Scripture better than our fathers did, does not admit of any doubt. Then, too, it is certain that all other and new material that can be gathered to throw light on the historical background of the Scriptures, from historical and archæological sources, from the diggings in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile, are all cordially to be welcomed, but welcomed with a cautious consideration and with a care to avoid overestimating their value and their importance.

And that such overestimation is characteristic of our times is only too apparent. At best, the new historical data that have been brought to bear on the study of the Scriptures deal almost exclusively with the external feature of the records of the Bible. We know probably ten times as much about the history of Egypt and of Mesopotamia in the days of Moses than Luther and his contemporaries did, but what we know better is confined almost entirely to material that will put Israel in its proper historical setting among the nations of its day, but will add little or nothing really to our knowledge of the religious and ethical purposes of the Law and the ends which according to the divine purpose it was intended to subserve in the economy of God's providence and in the development of the kingdom of God on earth from its beginning in Eden to the fullness of time in Bethlehem and Mount Calvary. This fact is lost sight of almost entirely in our days when the Biblical scholars of both the old and the new world go into ecstasies over the discovery of a new (or old) mummy in some tomb on the Nile that may or may not have been the mortal relics of the Pharaoh of the Exodus or of the Oppressor of Israel. Chronological perplexities, such as the year of the Exodus; topographical, such as the identification of the locality of the city of Capernaum or the site of Golgotha, and problems of this kind and character, that all belong to the *externalia* of the Scriptures, to the shell and not to the kernel of the

Scriptures, enlist the sympathies and interest of readers, learned and unlearned; and it is a question whether in this condition of affairs the more important things of the Bible, its doctrines and teachings concerning the lost and saved soul, have not been crowded into the background. It is not accidental that the department of dogmatics or doctrinal theology is comparatively speaking the most neglected in the current theological literature. The interest in Bible study has evidently been shifted from the heart and center to the periphery and the circle. And in putting the proper estimate upon what has actually been gained by the historic method, this fact must not be overlooked. In starting the balance-sheet of what has been gained, even legitimately and correctly, by the historical study of the Biblical books, the fact must be remembered that this has been accompanied by a corresponding loss, and that which has been lost, or at any rate lost sight of, is of much more importance than that which has been gained. In this respect the Bible of the new theology differs quite materially from the Bible of the old theology, and from surface indications we would say, that while the new school may know more *about* the Bible, the old school manifestly knew the Bible itself, i. e. its *real* contents, better.

But the difference between the two Bibles is still greater and is not confined to the transfer of interest from one part to another. The difference is found in the whole conception of the Scriptures. As the result of naturalistic factors and forces, the Bible actually becomes little more than an interesting collection of religious wordings from the pens of prominent religious thinkers in Israel, and as such, in kind and character and dignity, is really to be placed on the parallel with the "Sacred books" of the East, such as the Vedas, the Avesta and the Koran, all of which represent other types of religious development than that found in the Jewish collection of holy writings. In this condition of affairs the unity of the Scriptures is entirely lost in the collection of individual types of religious thought represented by the various writings. Still worse, the all-controlling guidance of the Holy Spirit, as the real author of the Scriptures, securing and guaranteeing the absolute inerrancy of the contents of the Scriptures, is lost. The Bible

can no longer be regarded as the Word of God, but at best contains the religious convictions of pious hearts and souls, that may or may not have been in themselves correct. That it is the purpose of the current Old Testament scheme practically to expel God from Israel and to eradicate the special providential feature in the history and the religious tenets and teachings of the Old Testament — an idea which criticism under various names applies also to the New Testament books — is admitted by Kuenen himself, next to Wellhausen, chief high priest of this class, who states that his theory is based upon the "principle" that "the religion of Israel is one of the chief of ancient religions, nothing less but also nothing more!" This removes entirely the *sui generis* element from the contents and books of the Old Testament and practically deprives them of their character of God's Word and salvation. That the Bible of the new school is not given by inspiration is *ex professo* and openly acknowledged, e. g. by Stade, who in his "*Geschichte Israels*" uses as sources of equal value and subject to the same critical canons and rules, both the canonical and the apocryphal books. The Scripture of the new theology has accordingly lost its unique character as the absolutely reliable and inspired revelation of God and has become only a religious book, indeed the most important one that men possess, but nevertheless one that is entitled to only so much credence as the reader or student is ready to assign to it.

What a Pandora box of untold evils these fundamental positions on the character of the Scriptures are for the preacher, the pastor, the Christian reader in general, is apparent at a glance. The Bible of the new school only by that happy inconsistency which so often characterizes men and makes their doings and their principles come into antagonism to each other, especially when the blunders of the head come into collision with the better sentiments of the heart, can continue to be the basis from which to preach to the congregations. Consistently the new school would be compelled to remove the Bible from the pulpits and indeed supplant preaching altogether by the lecture and the philosophical system.

For the old theology the Bible was and is the revelation of God's truth given by the One Spirit through many

prophets and apostles as the light to guide men to salvation; for the new theology, the Bible is a collection of religious literature, interesting and instructive, but not presenting one system of truth, but a historical development of religious thought, the benefit and advantage of which depending upon what each individual student or reader makes of the contents of these books.

Such is the contrast between the Bible of the old and the Bible of the new theologies. That there are compromise systems between the two—or at any rate attempts at a compromise—is certainly true; but it is impossible to effect a compromise between systems fundamentally and essentially at variance. This is a case of either—or. Delitzsch was right when he maintained that a “deep chasm” existed between the old and the new theology, and this chasm exists because there is a chasm between the Bible of the old and the Bible of the new theologies. In one word, the Scriptures of the one is the Bible without God; the Scriptures of the other is the Bible of and with God.

ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CULTUS.

In the year 1523, before the issue of the Formula Missae, Luther put out a pamphlet on “The Order of Divine Service in the Congregation,” in which he uses these significant words: “The Divine Service, which is now in use everywhere, has a pure Christian origin, as the office of Preaching has. But just as the Office of Preaching has been injured by the spiritual tyrants, so is the Divine Service injured by the hypocrites.

“As we do not desire to abolish the Office of Preaching, but to restore it to its proper place, it is not our desire to put away the Divine Service, but only to make it what it ought to be. Three great abuses have arisen in the Divine Service. God’s Word has been silenced, and there is only reading and singing in the churches. This is the greatest abuse. And since God’s Word has been silenced, so many

unchristian fables and lies have come in, in legends, hymns and sermons, it is horrible to see. And thirdly, such Divine Service has been done as a work by which to earn God's grace and salvation, and thus faith has altogether fallen away."

In these first words of Luther, which are the first in the Lutheran Church about the liturgical services, can be found the principles in regard to such services. The three abuses related by Luther can be traced to one, as the first two have their root in the third. The fundamental error and abuse in the Romish Church is this, that she, placing herself as the only mediator between God and the individual man, takes Christ's office from Him, and puts her own work and action in the place of the activity of Christ. The first consequence of the application of this fundamental error to the Divine Service is, that it is changed entirely into an action of the Church, and no place any longer remains therein, of which it could be said, that in it God and His Son appear in the Divine Service of the congregation in order to give and communicate themselves and their gifts to the congregation. The Lord gives Himself to the world and His Church in His Word and in His Sacraments; in the above fundamental consideration both fall short in application to the Divine Service. It is a common but false notion among Protestants that the Romish Divine Service comes forth alone in the Mass; but it has rather a great fulness of Matins, Vespers, Hours, etc., in none of which is there any Mass, but which are called essentially Service of the Word. On account of the above fundamental error the use of the Divine Word, of the Holy Scripture, vanished from the Service of the Word, and the church offered to God her own words in reading, singing and praying. The Sacrament of the Altar could not be pushed aside as the Word of God was, but remained as the center of the Mass. But the fundamental error gave to that which was outwardly held a signification opposed to the truth. The Lord's Supper did not hold the place in which the Lord gave the fruit of His death to His Church, and the Church enjoyed the same; but according to Romish conception the Church makes the Lord's body and blood through the agency of

the priest, and brings them to God as an offering daily perfected for the reconciliation of the world.

Thus the Romish Church appears over against the Lord no longer as the taking, as the receiving one, as the one needing to learn and to eat; but always ready and full of the possessions of the Lord, she has nothing further to do in her Divine Service than freely from the full treasure of her possession to offer to the Lord her words and works, her glory and praise, thanksgiving and honor. Even the individual member needs scarcely to make a personal appropriation; all offerings in the Divine Service, although brought by the individual priest, are to be thought of as the works of the whole Church, in whose offering every individual member of the Church has a part. The important thing is, that the individual through baptism, through holding the ordinances ordained by the Romish Church for her people, be incorporated into the Church. Incorporated into the entirety of the Church, the individual has part in her works; if he offers God such acceptable works, he is thereby pleasing in God's sight; and the individual church-member needs neither the continuous mediations of the grace and gifts of God, e. g., in the sermons, which mostly fall away, nor a subjective faith and holiness whose place is taken by his objective relation to the Church. With this point is connected the whole theory of the *opus operatum* as well as the efficaciousness of the religious ordinances, prayers, and sacrifices of the Mass, even for the absent and departed members of the Church, with their natural results, private mass and masses for the dead. But this proud presumption of the Romish Church leads immediately to an impoverishment in a threefold direction. First is the simple consequence that in such Divine Service only the priests, who bring the sacrifice by singing, reading and consecrating, take part in them; while the congregation, considered as taking part by the action of the priests, silently looks on. And because it depends upon the doing of these works only and not that through them something be done with the congregation, the number of the Divine Services are so increased that in the one church at the same hour a dozen masses are read; one priest is hurrying to the end and a second has just begun, while a third is in the

midst of his, and the congregation in such confusion of services stands and — watches. The priest reads, sings and prays, not for the people, but instead of the people in a strange tongue, and drinks the blood of the Lord for all. Secondly, every fervor of religious life must more and more lose its vitality in a congregation which foregoes the living streams of the Word of God and not once drink the blood of the Lord in order to live thereby but to offer it for the world; and it scarcely needs an intentional effort to uphold the dignity of the Romish Church also in this point, in order to arrive at the result that every expression of productiveness be excluded from the cultus, all brought to a fixed form, and regulated by a mechanism of practice, in which, especially in the retention of the theory of *opus operatum*, an edifying reaction upon the Church could not be expected to an extent more than a mere sacrificial Divine Service is yet able to bring about. Thirdly, the more the Romish Church in her Divine Service yielded the gifts of the Lord, and the more she was concerned to offer her own gifts, the more she came in time to set her own impure and defective productions instead of the Lord and His works in the place where the Lord's honor dwelleth: she put the days of her saints into the year of the Lord; she has legends read instead of the Word of God; she prays to her saints instead of to the Triune God.

When the Reformation arose against this confusion of dogmatic and historic fiction, a twofold attitude of opposition was possible. One could oppose the Romish system of the cultus because it is a departure from the original cultus, a traditional and not a pure form, that it is not apostolic or scriptural. The Reformed Church took this way of an abstract biblical principle; she did not examine the Romish cultus in a dogmatical way to ascertain what contradicted the Scriptures, but put aside by a mere outward historical comparison what did not appear to her to belong to apostolic time and the early Church; and so strictly has she continued therein that among other things she has made a small use of church hymns and instead has used versified psalms.

The Lutheran Church shares with the Reformed Church the principle of Scripturalness in so far that that

churchly institution passes as "pure" and permissible to her, which does not have the Scriptures against it but for it. But she in her opposition to the established service and in the restoration of the proper one was not satisfied with the outward historical canon of abstract immediate Scripturalness, but dogmatically grasped the opposing error as well as the appropriate truth. The chief passage through which this view of the Divine Service has become a part of the symbols of the Church is the well-known paragraph of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, "What is a sacrifice?" In this paragraph Melancthon combats the fundamental error of the Romish cultus, according to which it in all its parts is a work of the Church and a sacrifice offered to God by her, and places the following over against it. In Divine Service two things are to be observed: *sacrament* and *sacrifice*. Every ceremony or action in the cultus is *sacramental* in which God grants us what the promise connected with the ceremony offers; e. g. baptism, because it is an action which we do not offer to God, but in which God baptizes us and gives and offers us forgiveness of sins according to the promise. Every ceremony or action on the other hand is *sacrificial*, which we offer to God in order to show Him honor. The sacrificial, or the sacrifice, is also twofold: the *expiatory sacrifice*, i. e., an action which atones for guilt and punishment, reconciles God, and acquires forgiveness of sin for others; and the *thankoffering*, which does not merit forgiveness of sins, but which is offered by the reconciled person in order to return thanks for this or other benefits. An expiatory sacrifice according to Christian conception cannot be offered by men, but the only expiatory sacrifice, and the one offered once for all is the death of Christ. Heb. 10, 4 and 10. For us then there are only the thankoffering and sacrifice of praise; and all the cultus divides itself into the two, *sacramental*, in which the Word of God, baptism and the Lord's Supper come, and *sacrificial*, in which the sermon, faith, prayers, thanksgiving, confession, in short in the widest sense the sufferings and all good works of believers, come. The Romanists abolish this difference, which ought never to be done, for they supplant the sacramental Word of God; they do not permit the Lord's Supper to remain a

sacrament, in which God gives us the fruit of the sacrifice of His Son to enjoy, but make of it a sacrifice brought by themselves, and thus change their whole Divine Service, even that part which according to its nature is sacramental, into sacrificial.

According to this basis the Lutheran Church formed her Divine Service. Resting in the promise of the Lord, Matt. 18, 20, she believes and teaches that the Lord in the Divine Service of his Church is essentially and really present, and there imparts Himself and His gifts of grace to the Church in His Word and Sacrament, which the Lord has ordained to be the bearers of His Spirit and the medium of His grace, in order by the preaching of the one and the administration of the other to gather for Himself a church out of the world. Thus the Brandenburg Liturgy of 1533 says: "The great divine majesty, God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Himself is present in the church assembly, accepts the hymns and prayers of the congregation, and treats with the congregation through the divine Word and Sacrament, as Christ says: Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." These two parts in which the Lord is present and gives Himself to the congregation are therefore the first and most essential in the Divine Service; they are properly the *sacramental* in it, and all else, e. g. sermon, singing, attain a sacramental character only by their connection with them; they are plainly the essential, which cannot be absent, and dare not be increased or lessened, because by their presence the effectual nearness of the Lord is assured; and there can be no Divine Service without one of these being present. So Luther says: "Where God's Word is not preached, it is better that we do not sing or read or come together." The Churländ. K. O. of 1570 expresses it more fully: "The great difference between the ceremonies for the church service ordained by men and the alone saving Word of God and the blessed sacraments should be taught diligently to all Christians at all times. For these two, namely the Word of God and the two Sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are the essential things to our salvation, and they never can, should or may be perverted, changed, increased or lessened by

angels or men without great and fearful sin against conscience and unavoidable offense in the Church. Therefore Paul, Gal. I, plainly says: 'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, let him be accursed.' And I Cor. II: 'I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.' Then he declares the words of the institution. After that he speaks of the ceremonies, saying: 'The rest will I set in order when I come,' as can be further seen in the 14th chapter. These ceremonies belong to the external rites." It is evident that after such premises in Lutheran Divine Service teaching and imparting are the ruling and chief interest, and that first of all the Lutheran congregation in the Divine Service must take the attitude of receptive poverty not indeed over against the preacher but over against the Lord and His Word and Sacrament. Therefore complete Lutheran Church Orders place at the head in the introductory words to their paragraphs concerning the Divine Service what they in the narrow sense call ceremonies.

This is only one side. The Lutheran Church has an unshaken faith in the efficaciousness of the Divine Word and Sacrament. Where the one is preached and the other administered, there, she believes, a congregation will arise, be it large or small. The Mecklenburg Church Order says: "Where pure Christian doctrine is preached, there surely is God's Church, for there God works powerfully through His Gospel, and in this assembly there will always be some holy and elect who will be saved. When Word and Sacrament have gathered a congregation, and the congregation has received from them the life of the Lord, such life must necessarily manifest itself in the sphere of the life itself in all fruits of good works, and in the sphere of the cultus in petition and thanksgiving, in psalms and chants, in prayers and hymns, and in vows and confession. That is the *sacrificial* side of Divine Service in which the congregation planted by the Word and Sacrament approaches its Lord with prayer and separates from Him with thanksgiving, in contradiction to the *sacramental* side, in which the Lord bears His gifts to the congregation. The higher, purer and more unhindered the Lutheran Church holds the *sacramental* part of the communicating efficacy of the Lord,

so much the richer can she make her sacrificial life; for through the faithful use of the first, she receives the riches of inner life which flows forth in the second. We will see in the course of the discussion how richly the sacrificial part has been endowed, and only here, by way of example, recall the treasure of hymns and the musical riches of the Lutheran Church. First, whatever weight our Church gives to the sacrificial part of the Divine Service, she can never, according to the whole manner in which it arose, give to this offering of her thanks and prayers and the formulas and ceremonies applicable thereto, as the Romanists from an altogether different fundamental view to theirs, a sin-forgiving power and a meritorious value. She returns to the Lord only what He had given her, and offers, only not presumptuously but thankfully, those fruits which He had planted in her. Without exception all Lutheran Church Orders stand on this point as the Lunenburg of 1585: The papistic blot should not be put upon such human ceremonies, as if it were in itself a specially great Divine Service when these ceremonies ordained by men are performed in a prescribed manner, or that they are in and of themselves works of perfection, which have great favor in God's sight and have much more value than the works which God Himself has ordained in His commandments, or that by keeping such ceremonies diligently not only grace, forgiveness of sins and salvation can be merited before God, but more can be acquired than is necessary for one's own need, which can be used for the salvation of others, either given freely or sold for money. Secondly, it only needs a look at the way the Lutheran Church with justice views the origin of the sacrificial, in order to understand the other firmly held principle, namely, that the sacrificial never appears in itself and alone in the cultus, but only along with the sacramental out of which it grows.

THE CONVERTING GRACE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE TRANSITIVE CONVERSION OF A SINNER.

TRANSLATED FROM HOLLAZIUS' EXAMEN PART III, SEC. I, CHAP. IV, BY REV. PAUL S. L. JANOWITZ, A. B., LE MARS, PA.

Question 1. Is conversion here taken in the transitive or intransitive sense?

Here conversion is taken in the transitive sense and denotes an act of grace by which the Holy Spirit is said to convert a sinner, and a sinner is said to be converted (*a*). Intransitively taken, conversion signifies an immanent and reciprocal act of the will by which a sinner is said to convert himself (*b*).

Proof for (*a*). Since at present we are engaged in analyzing the acts of applying divine grace, it easily appears that we do not now consider formally the intransitive conversion of a sinner, or his response to divine grace. But that gracious act by which God converts a sinner is not without advantage called transitive conversion, not because it terminates in God, the agent, but because from Him it goes over to another subject, i. e. a sinner. To this action a passion responds, by which a sinner, not morosely rejecting, but passively admitting and receiving converting grace, is said to be converted by the Lord according to the statement of Jer. 31, 18: "Turn Thou me, O Lord! and I shall be turned." God actively converts; the sinner passively is converted. But active and passive conversion are really one and the same thing. It is called active with respect to God, the connotated agent, and so far as it proceeds from Him; it is called passive with respect to man, the connotated subject, and in so far as it is received by him.

Proof for (*b*). Intransitive conversion is the end and effect of transitive conversion; and is nothing less than repentance, by which a sinner through powers conferred by divine converting grace, passively received, is said to convert himself as a ship is said to turn itself not by powers of its own, but by powers of the sailors. Moreover, the reception of grace on the part of the sinner is rightly called intransitive conversion, since it does not go over to another

subject, but terminates in the sinner himself. On intransitive conversion the words of Peter deserve notice, Acts 3, 19: "Repent and turn [convert yourselves] that your sins may be blotted out." Therefore the sinner by repenting converts himself, not however by powers of his own, but by powers given him by God.

Question 2. In how many senses is transitive conversion taken?

Transitive conversion, by which God converts a sinner, is taken in a general, special and most special sense.

Question 3. What divine act is meant by conversion taken in a general sense?

Transitive conversion, by which a sinner is converted by God, when taken in a general sense embraces in its scope illumination, turning from sin, regeneration, justification, and sanctification.

Proof. Conversion is taken in a general sense in the Book of Concord (Mueller, Page 605, Par. 10): "This is most certain that in true conversion a change, renovation and a movement toward good ought to be made in man's intellect, will and heart. That, namely, the mind of man know sin, fear the wrath of God, turn himself from sin, recognize and apprehend the promise of grace in Christ, think pious thoughts in his soul, have good intentions and diligence in regulating his conduct, and strive against the flesh. For where no good is done, there beyond doubt there is no true conversion to God. Since, moreover, the question is about the efficient cause, that is, who works these things in us, whence a man has this, and in what manner he can attain it, this doctrine shows the good fountain of good in this way. Since the natural powers of man can confer nothing toward or bring any aid to conversion, God in ineffable goodness and mercy goes before us and sees to it that the gospel is preached through which the Holy Spirit wills to work and perfect conversion and regeneration, and through the preaching of, and meditation on, the Word kindles faith and other virtues in us." Very many theologians abstain from this wider sense of conversion, since from it confusion and error can easily creep into careless minds; yet unanimously the distinct acts of grace are so joined.

Question 4. What is meant by conversion taken in a special sense?

Conversion taken in a special sense is an act of grace by which the Holy Spirit excites by the word of the law in a sinner sharp pain on account of sin; but also by the word of the gospel kindles true faith in Christ that he may attain the remission of sins and eternal salvation.

Note 1. The starting point of conversion taken in a special sense is the state of sin, that most miserable condition of a sinner, who neither morally retracts sin nor seeks mercy or forgiveness of sin. Its stopping point is the state of faith, that better state of a sinner who indeed with intense sorrow of soul detests his sins, flees to Christ, the truly unique Mediator between God and man, apprehends His merits and satisfaction and opposes to God, the most just Judge, Christ's most valid ransom for his and the whole world's sins, and establish by his faith, seeks from Him the forgiveness of sins.

Note 2. The means of conversion taken in a special sense is the divine word, and that as well as the word of the law, by which contrition is wrought, as the word of the gospel, by which faith in Christ, the Mediator, is kindled.

Note 3. Regeneration is generally regarded as a synonym of conversion in the special sense. Nevertheless Dr. Koenig (Theo. Posit. Part III, § 451) states that there is some difference between conversion and regeneration. According to his opinion these two differ (1) because of their subjects: Adults and infants are regenerated; but only adults are converted; while infants can be said to be regenerated, yet they are not wont to be called converted (unless one may wish to predicate of them something analogous to conversion and repentance. Comp. Hodos., Page 1269). (2) Because of the means. Regeneration is wrought by Word and Sacrament; conversion through the Word alone. One can add (3) conversion is wrought by the Law and Gospel, regeneration through the Gospel alone.

Proof. Conversion in the special sense is proved (1) because God through the ministry of the Word by opening the eyes of sinners (by illuminating them) converts them from darkness to light. Acts 26, 18. Here by darkness

we do not exactly understand ignorance of mind; nor by light knowledge, so that a fuller description of illumination may be set forth by those words; because the succinctly delineated account of the call of Paul does not admit of a superabundance of words. But rather by *σκότος* (darkness) the works of darkness are meant. Rom. 13, 12; Eph. 5, 2. Moreover, by the word light is meant the light of faith, which word not rarely occurs in the Bible in the sense of light. Matt. 5, 16; Eph. 5, 8; 1 John 2, 9. 11. But believers are also called the children of light. Luke 16, 8; John 12, 36; 1 Thess. 5, 5. Therefore transitive conversion is meant, by which God converts a sinner through an act of grace, by which the Holy Spirit turns a sinner from the works of darkness by working in him a hatred for sin, and fills him with the light of faith.

(2) A man is converted that his sins may be blotted out. Acts 11, 19. And God gave the Gentiles repentance unto life. Acts 11, 18. Therefore by converting grace, beside an active contrition, faith in Christ is conferred without which neither remission of sins nor any spiritual life is obtained.

Question 5. What is conversion most strictly then?

Conversion taken in the most strict sense is an act of grace by which the Holy Spirit lays hold of the will and heart of a sinner in the very state of sin, breaks and crushes him, so that with pain of soul he detests sin and thus is prepared for receiving salutary faith in Christ.

Proof (1). In the most strict sense conversion is scriptural, because the Bible is wont to call that act by which the heart of a sinner is crushed conversion. Thus pray the Israelitish people: "Turn Thou me, O Lord, and I shall be turned (passive conversion), for after that I was turned (passive) I repented (taken in part for contrition) and after that I was instructed I smote upon my thigh. I was ashamed, yea even confounded (to the very act of contrition), because I did bear the reproach of my youth." Jer. 31, 19. And God, exhorting the Israelites to repent, says: "Turn ye unto me with your whole hearts, and with fasts, and with weeping, and with mourning; and rend your hearts and not your garments; and turn unto the Lord your God." Jer. 2, 12. 13.

Proof (2). As that is one act of applying grace by which God works contrition and as that is another act of grace by which He gives to the contrite sinner that faith which rests on the merits of Christ; so the first act of grace is with advantage called conversion (most strictly taken); the second, regeneration. God converts the sinner through the Law, regenerates him through the Gospel. Contrition is the effect of converting grace; faith is the effect of regenerating grace. Repentance taken as a whole (consisting of repentance and faith) is the effect of both acts of grace, i. e. of converting and regenerating grace, flowing together to produce one result. For repentance is a divine work; it is neither properly a virtue nor a disposition, but an act composed of contrition and faith, and therefore a result or work: a salutary antidote against the pest of sin, as Dr. Dannhauer, *Hodos.*, Page 1265, says.

Proof (3). By a natural order conversion precedes, regeneration follows, which order the Scriptures retain; since they in prophetic style describe conversion by the removal of the heart of stone, but regeneration by giving a heart of flesh. Ez. 1, 19 and 36, 23. The Scriptures in prophetic style express the former, Joel 2, 13; Ps. 51, 19, by the cutting and breaking of the heart, but the latter by the healing of the broken heart.

Proof (4). Experience itself shows this order of the acts of grace. The most wise God, about to convert the first parents of the human race after the fall, preached to them the Law, that, being thoroughly struck by its lightning, they trembled and suffered anguish. He then preached to the troubled and crushed ones the Gospel, that He might regenerate and justify them. Gen. 3, 7. 8 sq. After the apostolic sermon had been heard, Peter's auditors were pricked in their hearts and said to Peter and the other apostles: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (converting grace!) "Peter said to them, Repent" (active contrition which follows in the wake of passive conversion!) "and he baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (by which words regeneration through baptism is expressed) "for the remission of sins" (thus justification immediately accepts regeneration).

Proof (5). The Formula of Concord accurately distinguishes between the converting and regenerating grace of God (Mueller, Page 597, Par. 24): "A man is illuminated, converted and regenerated by the Holy Spirit"; and Page 610, Par. 90: "The intellect and will of a man not yet reborn are alone subjects for conversion; for the intellect and will of the man in whom the Holy Spirit works conversion and renovation are spiritually dead. To this work of converting a man the will confers nothing; but it permits God to work in it (now regeneration as the end of conversion follows) until it is regenerated." In this very strict meaning the word conversion is used by Dr. Carpzov in *Iso.*, Page 1244; B. Hoepfner, *Loc. Theol.*, Page 451; Dr. Neumann in *Disput. on the Relation and Distinction of Divine Grace*, § 13.

An objection to the above. Conversion through the law is not an act of grace, but of vindictive justice; because "the law worketh wrath." Rom. 5, 15. We reply: The law, good and holy in itself, works wrath because of the guilt of men who transgress the precepts of the law, by accusing them of, and condemning them for, their sins; but this work of the law is directed by the most merciful God for a salutary purpose in behalf of men. Very clearly does Dr. John Musaeus, *Disput. 2 on Conversion*, Chap. 3, Ed. Jena, Page 80, teach this: "The law is a kind of an instrument of divine grace which works in a sinner, softens his hard heart, prepares and disposes it for kindling in it faith in the word of the gospel.

Question 6. Of how many kinds is conversion?

Conversion is of two kinds—ordinary and extraordinary. The former is that act by which God by the word of the law as a means leads a sinful man in the usual way and manner to hatred of sin (*a*). The latter is that act by which God immediately or through a miracle so breaks a sinner that he earnestly bewails his admitted sins (*b*).

Proof for (*a*). Ordinarily God crushes the heart by the hammer of the law. Jer. 23, 29. And he cudgels them through the prophets or ministers of the Church, who are validly called and ordained. Hos. 6, 5.

Proof for (*b*). Extraordinarily God converts sinners either by speaking to them immediately or without the inter-

vention of His ministers. In this manner Abraham, Gen. 12, 1; the thief on the cross, Luke 23, 42; Paul, Acts 9, 34, were converted; or by furnishing His word or the ministers of His word with miracles and signs. Then, however, converting power is not to be ascribed to the miracles and signs, but to the divine word. Thus the miracles and signs that accompanied the death of Christ beat down the centurion and others who were standing about the cross, so that they smote their breasts.

Question 7. Of how many kinds is ordinary conversion?

Ordinary conversion is primary and secondary. The former is an act of the Holy Spirit by which He crushes and softens the hearts of unbelievers and those outside of the Church, so that He may kindle in them by the word of the gospel saving faith in Christ (*a*). The latter is an act by which the Holy Spirit recalls to repentance sinners who indeed live in the bosom of the Church, but fell from the state of regeneration into the commission of deadly sins (*b*).

Proof for (*a*). God gave the Gentiles repentance to life. Acts 2, 8. God calls Gentiles, Jews, Turks and Tartars into the Church of Christ, and in this work the Holy Spirit illuminates them and breaks their ferociousness with the hammer of the law that they may be prepared to receive faith in Christ.

Proof for (*b*). Men living within the wall of the Church, ruining conscience, make shipwreck of faith, 1 Tim. 1, 19, and lose the grace of God, Rev. 2, 5. These God calls to repentance: "Return thou, backsliding Israel, saith the Lord, and I will not cause my anger to fall upon you; for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and will not keep anger forever. Only acknowledge thine iniquity that thou hast sinned against the Lord thy God." Jer. 3, 12. 13. The conversion of these is called secondary, also the conversion of the backslidden.

Question 8. Who converts man?

God (*a*), the Father (*b*), the Son (*c*), and the Holy Spirit terminatively (*d*).

Proof for (*a*). Conversion on the part of God, the efficient cause, is active, only passive on the part of the

converted man; for God alone circumcises the heart, Deut. 31, 18; takes away the heart of stone, Ez. 11, 9; 36, 26; and gives repentance unto the knowledge of the truth, 2 Tim. 2, 25. Therefore God alone actively converts that man may be passively converted, Jer. 31, 18; Lam. 5, 21.

Proof for (b). God the Father commands all men everywhere to repent, for He has appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness through the man whom He has appointed, Acts 17, 30. Observe: Since God the Father commands sinners to repent, He also likewise offers and confers converting energy, unless they maliciously resist.

Proof for (c). Christ is said to turn away iniquity from Jacob, Rom. 11, 26. He who in the days of His flesh used the public gift commenced to preach: Repent and believe the gospel, Mark 1, 15. Christ stands at the door of the heart and knocks with the hammer of the law by moving the sinner to repentance, Rev. 3, 20.

Proof for (d). The Holy Spirit convinces the world of sin and proves that the unbelief by which Christ, the Mediator, is rejected is the greatest sin, John 16, 9.

Question 9. By what means does God convert a sinner, so that he hate sin?

God by the word of the law converts the sinner, so that with grievous sorrow of soul he detest sin (a), and is prepared to receive faith in Christ from the word of the gospel (b).

Proof for (a). (1) As from the law is the knowledge of sin, Rom. 3, 20, so also sorrow for sin follows the knowledge of sin. (2) "The law worketh wrath," Rom. 4, 15, by pointing out sin, by denouncing the curse of the law on transgressors and by infusing terror into them. On this account it is said to slay and condemn, 2 Cor. 3, 6. 9. "Know that the law, moreover, slays not so much after the manner of a physical as after the manner of a moral cause; not so much by destroying us entirely as by adjudging and condemning us to death; although in this respect it is said to slay as a physical cause, because it crushes and mortifies our hearts, so that they feel nothing but death and that we too, prostrated by the lightning stroke of the law, must perish, unless grace succor us." Thus says Dr. Calo-

vius explaining the verse above quoted in *Bibl. Illustrat.*, Fol. 443.

Proof for (b). The law is a schoolmaster unto Christ, Gal. 3, 24, because He is called the end of the law, Rom. 10, 4. God sanctions this order that the rocklike and ironlike hearts of sinners may be crushed by the divine law as by a hammer, and be softened as by fire (see Jer. 23, 29) and be prepared to receive faith in Christ and to seek forgiveness of sins through Him. Dr. Chemnitz, in *Exam. Concil. Tri.* fol. M. 155, shows this order: "Certainly a sure order or mode is designated and prescribed in the word of God, which order God uses when He wills to lead a man to justification, that he should accept reconciliation, forgiveness of sin, adoption, etc. And those who do not wish to accommodate themselves to the divinely prescribed way and order by the leadings of the Spirit, but neglect and strive against it, do not attain to justification; for God wishes to order us from knowledge of and assent to His Word. And contrition ought to precede justification, i. e. a grievous knowledge of sin, terrors of conscience, which knows the wrath of God toward our sin and which feels pain on account of sin. In this contrition the purpose of persevering and living in iniquities is not retained, but put away. But to these terrors it is necessary that faith come, which, by knowledge of and trust in the promised mercy of God for His Son, the Mediator's sake, again raises and consoles the soul; lest oppressed by despair we rush into eternal destruction. But faith goes to God, asks, desires, begs, apprehends, and accepts the remission of sins. The Scriptures themselves say that in this way or order, designated in the Word of God, the way of the Lord is prepared that in and through and for Him we attain to and accept justification. For thus the voice in the wilderness cries out, Prepare ye the way of the Lord. Is. 40, Matt. 3, Mark 1, and Luke 3. Gabriel says, Luke 1, of the ministry of the Baptist, who preached the baptism of repentance: Prepare a people ready for the Lord." Dannhauer in *Hodos. Phaenom.* 11, Page 1260, explains this order. "The divine order demands on our part repentance, first required in the preaching of Christ and the apostles, to prepare a way for the Lord. This divine order intimated in the first sermon

of Christ: 'Repent and believe the Gospel,' Mark 1, 15, is not effected nor merited by man, but leads and in a sober sense prepares him. By this order the way to the Lord is prepared and made ready, Matt. 3, 3. But it is privative, removing and prohibiting, as in medicine a remedial removal of corruption precedes pure things. Removing, I say, the incapacity of, and the obstacles to, the forgiveness of sins, i. e. the not unnatural thought and desire of living in sin, John 9, 41; Is. 66, 2; Rev. 3, 19.

Question 10. What servants does God use in the conversion of sinners?

God in the conversion of sinners ordinarily uses holy preachers validly called (a). Extraordinarily any pious Christian can recall an erring one to the right way (b).

Proof for (a). 1 Cor. 3, 9: "We are coworkers with God." Holy preachers are called coworkers with God not by an innate ability, but by grace given them by God. 1 Cor. 15, 10. They are coöperators with God, not equally as if in the work of conversion they were causes coördinate with God, but because they are subordinate and less principal or ministerial causes of conversion.

Proof for (b). James 5, 20: "Let him know that whoever converts a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and shall cover a multitude of sins."

A doctrine contrary to the above is held by the Schwenkfeldians, who derogate efficacious conversion from the divine word and holy ministers. They rely on the following reasons to establish their opinion: 1. "God works all in all," 1 Cor. 12, 6. Therefore He does not need coworkers. We reply that in the work of conversion God works all things not immediately but mediately through the holy ministry to which He has given ministering gifts. 2. Neither he who sows nor he that watereth availeth anything; but God who giveth the increase." Therefore in the work of conversion the minister of the Church avails nothing. We reply (a) the ministers of the Church avail nothing apart from their office, so far as they are not subordinate to Christ. (b) In their office they indeed avail something, since they are stewards of the mysteries of God. 1 Cor. 4, 1. Nevertheless they refer the power that they have received to Christ as its head and fountain. Therefore

in their office comparatively (comparing them with Christ) they avail nothing.

Question 11. Who is to be converted?

An adult, turned from God through mortal sins (*a*) whose will, prone to sin, is beaten down by the stroke of the law that he detest them (*b*), but whose fleshly lusts are so goaded by the sword of the law that he is moved to a grievous sorrow for sin (*c*).

Proof for (*a*). Properly an adult is said to be converted, because he is alone capable of hearing, reading and meditating on the law of God, as also of detesting sin. Since infants, owing to their tender age, are destitute of this capacity, they are indeed said to be regenerated; but they are not usually said to be converted. But an adult is either through faith joined with God and reborn, or through unbelief and mortal sin is averse to God and unregenerated. Accurately speaking, an adult who was turned from God, whom iniquity separated from God, Is. 59, 2, is said to be converted. Repentance is also indeed given to those who stand, i. e. to reborn and believing men who persist in the state of the new birth and grace. Yet since they have sins which they ought daily to recognize, detest and bewail, they are therefore on this account rightly said to be capable of conversion. But it must be confessed that the word conversion is then taken in a more general sense, which (word) has its subject in a more special sense a wicked person only who though made with power for a union of himself with God is not actually united with God. See Bayer's Comp., Part 3, Chap. 4, Page 729.

Proof for (*b*). The will of the unregenerated man is indeed carried headlong into evil, forbidden by God's law, so that it cannot even be subject to the law through a passive natural power. Rom. 8, 7. Nevertheless the will of the unregenerated man is a subject in which conversion takes place. Since in it there is given an obediential, passive power by which it is fitted for the reception of converting grace and spiritual powers for putting sin away morally and rejecting the purpose of doing unlawful acts.

Proof for (*c*). The fleshly lusts rage by indulging in inordinate affections unless divinely pricked. The hearers of Peter were pricked in their hearts, Acts 2, 37. By so

great a grief their hearts, the seat of the affections, were lacerated that it appeared as if they were punctured by a needle or bored through by a lance.

Note. Some authors refer the intellect of the unregenerated man to the subject to be converted. These do not distinguish the act of illumination from that of conversion. But since illumination in our opinion is a peculiar act of applying grace, we presume here that the intellect, illuminated by the divine Word, recognizes the corruption of sin and applies the light to the will which in itself is blind.

A doctrine contrary to the above is held by the Pelagians, Papists, Socinians and Arminians, who attribute an active ability to convert to the human will. We have considered their chief arguments in Part 2, Chap. 6. A few remain to be treated here: (1) Whoever converts himself has in his power active abilities to elicit his own conversion. But an unregenerated man converts himself. Therefore an unregenerated man has active abilities to elicit his own conversion. The major premise is evident because to convert oneself denotes an immanent and reciprocal act which presupposes an active power. The minor premise is proved by Acts 3, 17: "Repent and *turn*." We reply: Whoever converts himself by his own natural powers has in his power active abilities to elicit his own conversion. But an unregenerated man does not convert himself by his own natural powers, but by supernatural powers given him through the converting grace of the Holy Spirit and passively received by the unregenerated man as a ship is said to turn itself not by its own but by the powers of sailors and winds.

(2) Whoever is converted not forcibly but freely, can determine his will to convert itself actively. But a sinner is not converted forcibly, but freely. Therefore he can determine his will to convert itself. The major premise is proved, because if a man were determined to his conversion by any other principle than his will, he would be converted not freely but forcibly. For whatever is determined to one of opposite things it is no longer free, but forced to act. The minor premise is evident because a sinner is not converted by a grace necessitating or bringing with it any violence, and therefore he is free. We reply by denying the major premise, since a sinner is indeed freely converted negatively

in so far as he can impede his conversion; but not positively, as if his will could dispose or determine itself to conversion by its own natural powers. For a sinner is spiritually dead before he is regenerated, Eph. 2, 5. And therefore he is destitute of active powers. Hence we say to the proof, that a man is determined indeed by converting grace, but by such a grace as acts through a resistible power, which has no accompanying necessity except a conditional one. But this does not make void liberty, but can be done with it.

(3) God so converts man, that not God, but man repents. Therefore there is a presence of powers from God, but the exercise of them is man's work, who as a particular cause determines himself actively to the act of conversion, because otherwise it would follow, if the powers and their exercise were ascribed to God, man would be denominated by an exercise of this kind. We reply: Repentance is considered either with respect to its origin or its receiving subject. Repentance with respect to its origin is transitive conversion, by which God not only gives the power to repent, but the repentance itself. Acts 11, 18. The subject suffering and receiving supernatural powers is the sinner who, converted passively by God, repents by using and exercising and splendidly showing the supernatural powers which he received. Christ, by resuscitating the dead Lazarus, gave him both the power to live and life itself. Nevertheless by conferring this life not Christ, but Lazarus, is called alive, because he used the powers of living which were given him. So the Holy Spirit confers the power for repentance and leads on the given powers by a special motive to action; so that not the Holy Spirit, but the sinner is said to repent, because he uses the powers to repent which were given. (To be continued.)

FUNERAL SERMON.

PREACHED BY REV. E. L. S. TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

ROMANS 8, 38-39.

Beloved:—To be of an unsettled mind in anything is to be in a state of unrest. To be of doubtful mind respecting our eternal condition is to be in a very unhappy frame.

The Scriptures testify of the certainty the human heart may possess when looking out beyond the confines of time. Job says: I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God. (19, 25, 26.) St. Paul testifies: I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day. (2 Tim. 1, 12.) Every Christian should strive to become more clearly certain of his salvation every day.

While we are gathered around the casket of our father let us cheer our hearts by the consideration of

THE CERTAIN SALVATION OF GOD'S BELIEVING ONES.

We find

- I. Their stronghold secure,
- II. Their foes impotent,
- III. Their hearts exultant.

Believers are kept in a safe stronghold. It is not the mere omnipotence of God. It is love. However, it is not the love which we have to God. That like the human passions in general is at best a very uncertain thing to reckon upon. Our love is never perfect, and is often wavering and cold. There must be a better protection than this for us.

The fortress in which the believer enjoys safety is the love that God has to us. God is love. Yet it is not the love that He has toward all the workmanship of His hand, but the love that He has for those in Christ Jesus. It is the love of God in Christ Jesus; the love of a father to his children. It is the love that Jesus has revealed to us. It is God revealed to us in Jesus Christ, the God of infinite, saving love.

It is the love grounded in Jesus Christ. Without the Master's mediatorial work, without the atoning sacrifice of the Son, God would be to us a consuming fire. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His son to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 John 4, 10.) Mark well the fact that it is "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

This is the love that is proclaimed to the world through the Gospel, dispensed through the sacraments. It is the love that seeks out through the means of grace the individuals. It brings them to spiritual life. It is shed abroad in their hearts and awakens a living consciousness in their souls that God is love. It is this love that procures protection both for the inner and outer life. The inner life is nourished, established and confirmed. The outer life is guided, defended and watched over. It engages the heavenly army to battle for believers. It binds God with all that He is in Himself and all that He has done by His Son and all that He can do by the Holy Ghost to keep His children safe in sickness and health, in joys and sorrows, in life and death, in time and eternity; and to bring them into blessedness, against all foes, be they who or what they may.

Remember this love has not its foundation in us. God loves us in Christ. He loves us because we are in Christ. What moved God to love us as children in Christ? He is lovely, beautiful; so are we in Christ. God loves us not only in the sense of pity because we were wretched and helpless, but because He finds something in us that is like Himself, that is worthy of His love. But this is nothing which springs from ourselves; it is Jesus, the Son of God. He loves us as His own because His own Son is found in us and is our righteousness, our beauty, our life.

This love encompasses the child of God. It brings him under the shadow of God's wing. It esteems him dear as the apple of God's eye. God is on our side. If God be for us, who shall be against us!

For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee. (Isa. 54, 10.)

Notwithstanding the safety of our refuge, yet it is attacked on all sides.

St. Paul names the enemies one after another. He says: "I am persuaded that neither death nor life shall separate us from the love of God." Death is indeed a terrible enemy. It says: God cannot love you. You only imagine that He loves you. Think of the horrible separation of body and soul, the darkness of the night of death, the cold, silent chambers of the dead in the heart of the earth. Life is coupled with so much trouble. We come into the world through travail and weeping; we spend our years in toil, and grief, and distress; we end our life in sadness. Thus life taunts us and hurls its darts against the stronghold of God's love.

The apostle continues: "I am persuaded that neither angels, nor principalities, nor powers shall separate us from the love of God."

These are the devil's individually, as well as in thoroughly organized array led by princes in cunning and wickedness and manifesting their might as apparent irresistible powers "in signs and lying wonders and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." They call forth persecution, they awaken doubts, they beget fears, they belie God, they slander the Redeemer, they blaspheme the Holy Ghost and thus they attack the fortress of God's love.

"The old bitter foe
Now means deadly woe:
Deep guile and great might
Are his dread arms in fight,
On earth is not his equal."

"I am persuaded that neither things past nor things present nor things to come shall separate us from the love of God." Saul, says the present, see what misery and wretchedness you must endure, and will not the future only add to this state of things? What present help have you and what prospect lies before you for the future? All your labor and toil and concern are of no avail. God does not love you. There is no help for you. Shall not this strong fortress give way under such attacks?

Then height and depth and all creatures add their might to the assaults already made. Honor, position, greatness, wealth appeal to the soul against the love of God with pride, ambition, lust, ease, pleasure. Neglect, debasement, forsakenness, hunger, nakedness in turn cry out against the love of God. Finally every and all creatures, celestial and terrestrial, the workmanship of God's own hand seemingly stand together against the human soul to destroy its rock of defense, the love of God in Christ Jesus.

No real Christian is exempt from these attacks. If you believe in Christ every devil in hell, and every wicked man on earth who knows you, will set on you to destroy your confidence in the love of God. The believing dead passed through these conflicts. Our deceased father now lying before us met these enemies and overthrew them. However formidable these foes seem, yet they are impotent. They "can harm us none."

Let St. Paul tell us how these foes are met by those who are entrenched in the stronghold of God's love. Let St. Paul teach us in his own way, inspired by the Spirit, how the heart of the believer may become exultant over every foe.

The apostle does not let us fall into the false security that, because our safety lies in the love of God which has pitied us, redeemed us, called us, fellowships us, therefore we are to live in stoic indifference, or in spiritual idleness. We are called to defend our citadel, not that God needs our aid against the strong, but because He has been pleased, for our own good and pleasure, to enlist us in the defense of ourselves in maintaining for ourselves the impregnable stronghold of His love. The fortress cannot be taken, but we may get outside of it and be captured. Remember our place of safety is in the love of God in Christ Jesus. We are within this secure enclosure when we believe in Jesus. This is the means of our defense as well as the means of our admission within the safe walls of God's love in Jesus Christ. St. Paul repels every tempting spirit with cheerful courage. To death he would say, Although thou art bitter, yet art thou sweet to me. For me to die is gain. I have a desire to depart and to be with Christ. Life, thou sayst thou art sweet. To me it is not true. To others it may

be a pleasure, to me it is a burden. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? To live long is to sin much. Every day brings its crosses and trials. Nothing good dwells in my flesh. If I have Christ, He is all I want. To fallen angels, principalities and powers he says, All that you say against God and Christ are lies. All that you do against my soul by your deception are but snares and wickedness to destroy me. Christ tells me that I am God's child because I have put Him on in the means of grace. I have been baptized. I have been absolved. I have received the body and blood of Christ. O evil one, whatever power you may have to hurt me is permitted from heaven for my discipline. Do with me as you may, you cannot separate me from the love of God. Neither things present nor things to come shall harm me. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. God is the same God as of old. He will be to me to-day what He was yesterday, what He was to Abraham, to David, to Job. Against height and depth and every other creature I place this faithful God and Savior. Let them all come, still I am safe. "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Whence comes, however, this exultant heart of the apostle and of all believers? Turn back to the sixteenth verse of this same chapter and you will find the secret of this exultant spirit: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." While it may be difficult for the heart to describe this witness, yet it knows its powers and contents. The Spirit makes the heart sure that Jesus is truly the Son of God and its own Savior. He makes the heart conscious of its faith, of the object of its faith, of the power of the means creating faith. The Spirit says, Here is Jesus, believe on Him. The heart responds, I do believe in Him. The Spirit says, If you believe in Jesus, you are enclosed in the stronghold of God's love. The soul responds, It is an indisputed fact God's love encircles me. The Spirit says, If you believe in Christ you will love His Word and abide in it. You will love everything that is good and hate all evil. The soul says, I do love God's Word: "The words of Thy mouth are better to me than thousands of gold and silver." "His delight

is in the law of the Lord and in His law doth He meditate day and night." Yes, faith says, I do love that which is good and I hate that which is evil. I see too that all these blessed evidences of faith are even the fruits of faith. Spirit of God, I adore Thee for these proofs of my sonship in God and for the certainty that I am safe in the love of God. When times of trials come and when the faith is weak and lacks courage, dear soul, turn to the Spirit of God, who will strengthen you and keep you unto life eternal.

Through these struggles and conflicts our deceased father passed. These were his experiences. For him the strife is o'er, the battle won. He is eternally safe in the stronghold of God's love above. Amen.

DIGESTS FROM DISCUSSIONS OF FOREIGN JOURNALS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

I. THE SECTS IN JUDAISM.

The Israelites are not only one of the most unique people, but the ups and downs of their religious record are a most interesting and instructive factor in the annals of mankind. A bird's-eye view of the sects that have appeared in the history of the Jews was recently given by the prominent Jewish Rabbi of Munich, Dr. C. Warner, in a lecture delivered in the "Society for Jewish History and Literature" in the Bavarian capital city. A resumé is herewith given of this interesting discourse:

At all times in its history of thousands of years has Judaism been endangered not only by the attacks of outward foes, but also by sects from within. Whenever a rupture has taken place within the Jewish communion on religious grounds these have generally been caused by influences from without, often of a political character, or by the agitation of gifted fanatics, and such separations have generally been highly injurious to the development and prosperity of the Jewish people in various lands. The oldest sect among the

Jews are the Samaritans, who now yet live there where at one time the lost ten tribes had their abode, and were organized out of the remnants of Israelites left at the time of the Assyrian captivity together with heathen elements settled at Nablus by the conquerors. The Samaritans accept only the five books of Moses as of canonical authority and reject the Prophets, the Hagiographa, the Talmud and all Tradition. Mount Gerizim is for them the sacred hill, and there where their temple once stood they still worship. They consider themselves the true Israelites and deny to Jerusalem and the temple there all claims of sanctity.

An altogether different picture is presented to our eyes when we look at the second period of sect formations among the Israelites. After the brilliant victories of the Maccabees, the Jewish people were divided into the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes. The first two can be properly called parties,—namely the Pharisees the popular and the Sadducees the aristocratic—while the Essenes became a separate, world-avoiding sect. They lived a retired life, were poor, ascetic, did not marry, were given to esoteric teachings, practiced miracle working, and lived according to special rules of their order.

A later sect were the Jewish Christians. These people acknowledged the Founder of Christianity as the Messiah, but fulfilled all the demands of the Mosaic law and in general were in agreement with Jewish religious teaching. In all other respects they had remained Jews, except in this that they accepted Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. They remained as a separate sect in Palestine and Syria for fully three hundred years.

After the completion of the Talmud various tendencies of religious thought appeared in the Israelitish fold that denied the authentic character of tradition and accepted only the letter of the written word. In the middle of the eighth century this idea found its boldest advocate in Anan. This Anan, offended because he was not appointed to a prominent office, collected a large number of followers and founded the sect of the Karaites, i. e. those who read only the Scriptures [*Kara*=to read], and accept only its authority. The Karaites are distinguished from other Jews in many respects, such as the observance of the Sabbath and the

festival days, the liturgy of the cultus, laws of marriage, etc. In doctrinal matters also they have many peculiarities. In early years they possessed a notably large literature, and the same controversies that took place among the Sunnites and the Shiites among the Mohammedans were carried on also between the Karaites and Rabbinites among the Jews. Now the Karaites are found chiefly in the Krim and other portions of Southern Russia. They are the Protestants among the Jews, and are honest, hard-working artisans, trades-people and farmers. Their sect is gradually falling into decay because it is not subjected to the law of development.

More dangerous than those mentioned were the Sabbathians, a sect that recognized in Sabbathai Zwi the promised Messiah and also maintained that a portion of the Law was not binding on the people. Since the destruction of the second temple a number of false Messiahs had arisen, who in times that were troublesome to the Israelites, claimed to be sent to deliver the nation. Bar-Cochba, Serene, and others, misled the people; but none of them succeeded in doing so much mischief as Sabbathai Zwi, who was born in Smyrna in 1626 and succeeded in splitting the Judaism of this generation into two great opposing camps. This remarkable man, through his personal appearance, the power of his song, and his faith in himself, as also through the Kabbalistic or mystical tendencies among his cotemporaries, was able to enthuse not only the uneducated but also the thinking people of his times with the confidence in his messianic calling. Even his death did not destroy the fascination, and to the present day there is found in Salonichi a congregation of 4000 Jews, called Donmahs, who are yet adherents of his teachings. It is one of the remarkable phenomena of history that the Judaism of that age at the same time produced a Spinoza and a Sabbathai Zwi.

A similar, only more fanatical sect were the Frankians. Jacob Frank, born in Galicia in 1712, had become a convert to Mohammedanism. Later he put forth the claim that he was the promised Messiah in whom all the other religious founders in history had reappeared. He instituted terrible orgies and his followers became morally and spiritually depraved. In order to protect himself against attacks and

accusations, he made the wildest charges against the Judaism of his day, that had quite naturally discarded him. Finally he and his followers joined the Christian Church. Yet he continued to put forth his claim that he was the Messiah of the Jews, and his adherents clung to him and worshipped him as a divine being. Even after he had been imprisoned for years on account of fraud the faith in him as a "holy Lord" did not entirely disappear until in 1791 he ended his life of adventures in Offenbach.

All these pseudo-Messianic propagandas could not gain a permanent foothold in Israel, since Judaism finds in the Messianic idea an era of peace and love of mankind. The latest and last sect, which deserves notice, and which has many adherents in Poland, Galicia, Hungary and elsewhere, are the Chasidim, or "Pious." At the same time when Moses Mendelsohn, the enlightened philosopher of the Jewish communion, was flourishing, the Chasidim began to develop in Poland, demanding absolute and implicit subjection to a visible head, frequently called "the Jewish Pope" by others, as also a degenerate exhalation of soul, enmity against modern learning and science, superstitious beliefs, and the like. The political pressure to which they are subjected, as also their separation from all civilization and culture, brought it about that this movement became numerically powerful. They have developed some excellent qualities, such as a willingness to aid one another, a firm and absolute submission to the guidance of Providence, etc. In Russia they are spreading more and more every day.

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ULTRAMONTANISM.

A number of causes have conspired to make the Ultramontane problem one of the burning questions of the day, especially in Germany. In contradistinction from the Catholic Church, Ultramontanism is understood to be the political activity and ambitions of the authorities of that church as controlled chiefly by the Jesuits and aiming at an international sovereignty of the Pope to the detriment or even destruction of distinctive national ideas or ideals. Largely through the writings and addresses of the famous ex-Jesuit

convert, Count von Hoensbroeck, a regular literature has in recent years appeared on this subject, in the production of which such men as Professor Beyschlag, of Halle, Professor Nippold, of Jena, Professor Delbrück, of Berlin, and the entire Protestant *Bund* of Germany has taken part. At the recent course of "Vacation Lectures," delivered by Professor Selle, of the University of Bonn, the origin and development of this pronounced feature of modern religious-political life was discussed in detail, and of this interesting investigation the author publishes a detailed synoptical account in the *Christliche Welt*, of Leipzig, Nos. 1 and 2. The unique feature of this historical survey consists in the thesis that Ultrantonanism is really an outcome of the French revolution. We reproduce the following data:

A study of the development of Roman Catholicism during the nineteenth century demonstrates that by a certain historical necessity Catholicism has been gradually changing into Ultramontanism, a religious system has become a semi-political system. Ever since the Reformation Protestants have been inclined to identify Catholicism with Ultramontanism, and by doing so have actually done the authorities of the Catholic Church a great favor. And yet we know that the Church was Catholic long before she obeyed any Pope, and that not even the Council of Trent in a decided manner took the papal standpoint. This unfortunate mixing of two things that differ *toto coelo* has also caused the mismanagement of the Old Catholic movement by the state.

In order to understand the development of Catholicism into Ultramontanism, the proposition must be maintained that the historical origin of this process must be sought for in the revolutionary era at the close of last century; and it is a remarkable phenomenon that the reckless autocrat who out of ruins and wrecks built up a new Catholic French Church, only for the purpose of using it for his own world-supremacy, was Napoleon I, who in reality is the founder of the world sovereignty of the Pope. This explains, too, why Pius VII, who had shamefully been abused by Napoleon, nevertheless entertained an almost religious veneration of the French Emperor. No body or state drew greater gains from the various revolutions of the past cent-

ury than did the Papacy; and it is remarkable that there are still loyal people who do not see that the Roman Papal System is the most powerful instrument of demagoguery in the world, a Cæsarism upon an ochlocratic basis.

Modern Catholicism is a product of the German mind. The ideas of Ultramontanism come from the French emigration; its political tendencies are a production of liberalism; its technic the work of the Jesuits; its purpose is to extend the rule of international Papacy at the expense of nationalities, of political independence and civic liberty.

A threefold revolution "from above" has created the state of affairs prevailing in the Catholic Church of our century. The French revolution of 1789 had decentered the Church of France and had established a new national Church, and the Pope, by a Concordat of 1807, had sanctioned this revolution, and, as though he were the lord over all the Bishops, had compelled these to forego their claims to their seats. By this single act he had virtually given the death-blow to the hated system of Gallicanism, with its independent spirit and rights. Then the German princes, both Catholic and Protestants, at their head the Emperor, who was the official Protector of the Church, did practically the same thing and aided in making the Pope the center of Catholicism. Before the Revolution, there were in existence a series of National Catholic churches, against which the Popes often maintained their position with difficulty. Now, however, the Papacy becomes a monarchic system in organization and spirit. The Napoleonic Concordat showed the different governments the way to deal with the Pope in reference to matters of the Church.

Hand in hand went with this the development of German Romanticism in the close of the last and beginning of the present century, which in the production of a new theology in the Church, a new art and the like, on the ideals of the middle ages, contributed its share to the regeneration of the life and thought of the Catholic Church in harmony with this outward revolution.

Another element that contributed toward the development of Ultramontanism originated in French literature with the avowed purpose of reestablishing the authority and the dignity of the Church. Its leaders were such men as

the Count de Maistre, de Bonald and de la Mennais. In this literature there is held up against the sovereignty of reason, as preached by the Revolution, the sovereign authority of the Church and its official head. The Ultramontan theory of to-day in this way had its origin in France, in the hearts of the most bitter opponents of both the Revolution and the old Gallicanism. Everything that Ultramontanism possesses in the shape of position and critical thought is already found in that brilliant literature of restoration, that found such wide-spread acceptance in the circles of the Legitimists; but the practical consequences that latterly developed therefrom are products of the Revolution. The alliance between the clerical and the royalist elements in France called forth those Bourbon struggles which finally ended in the July revolution. The first efforts to establish the principles of clericalism in France did indeed fail under Louis Philipp; but what did not succeed here was all the more successful in the Belgian revolution of 1830. From that time on Belgium has been the fold where clericalism has sought to attain its ends through Parliament and popular agitation, by the control of the political offices, of the schools, and other factors and forces in national life.

In order to attain the purposes in view, an alliance between Catholicism and Liberalism has been on the program. This has been most brilliantly proclaimed and practiced in France by Lamennais, in his journal *L'Avenir*, with the motto *Dieu et Liberté*. Among his allies were Count Montalembert and the greatest Catholic preacher in France in the nineteenth century, Lacordaire. The program of this party was religious freedom, freedom of the press, liberty of assemblages, freedom in education, complete separation of Church and State. It is true that Lamennais' views were condemned by the Pope in 1834, but just at present again his ideas are virtually incorporated in the program of a liberal republic in the service of the Pope.

His ideas fell on fruitful ground in Germany, and led to the clerical agitation in state and Parliament in favor of the supremacy of the Pope, which is so characteristic of public life in the Fatherland at present and the chief expression of the "Ultramontane danger" of the hour.

III. WOMEN AND THE UNIVERSITIES OF GERMANY.

It is the most natural thing in the world that the attitude of German educators toward the claims of the modern women for the privileges and prerogatives of a university education is a matter of special interest, as the German universities and their methods and manners easily stand at the head of the higher educational work of the world. Just what the status of this burning question is in "this land of scholars and thinkers," as the Germans with pardonable pride are accustomed to call their land, appears from a lengthy article in the Stuttgart illustrated journal "*Ueber Land und Meer*," No. 34, the discussion being from the pen of the litterateur Richard Wulchow. In substance the article reports the following data:

In Germany the question of the higher education of women has made some progress, but it has also met with decided opposition in higher circles of influence. The former Rector of the Berlin University, Professor Dr. Brunner, in an official address spoke sneeringly of the propaganda. Yet within recent months new privileges in this direction have been granted at other universities. In Leipzig women are admitted, not as immatriculated students, but as "hospitants," or hearers to the lectures of nearly all the teachers. In Bonn, Breslau and Göttingen steps have been taken to facilitate the attendance at lectures on the part of women. In Halle all the laboratories, seminaries and lectures are now open to those women who have passed the necessary admission examinations. Göttingen has lately granted the same permission. On the other hand, however, not a single one of the twenty universities of Germany will admit women to immatriculation, and consequently to the full rights of students to graduation, degrees, etc. Accordingly too the state will not admit women to examination for professional positions, such as the legal or medical, as these examinations can be taken only by those who have passed the university tests. In Berlin especially have difficulties been put into the way of women who want to study medicine. Only one of the medical faculty, Dr. Benda, was willing to arrange for a dissecting course for this class of students.

To a certain degree the status of women at the universities have been practically legalized in late years. Permission to attend lectures is based on the consent of the Cultus Minister of the country, the Rector of the University and the professor whose courses are desired. But with all this those who secure this threefold consent are only "hospitants."

In this respect Austro-Hungary has been more liberal than Germany. In Vienna women are admitted to all lectures and to doctor examinations. The first promotion of this kind took place April 2, 1897, on which occasion the Rector, Dr. Reimsch, declared that by this step the tradition of half a thousand years had been broken.

Just at present and during the present term Berlin, owing chiefly to the friendly attitude of the new Rector, Professor Schmoller, has become the headquarters for the university women of the Fatherland. One year ago there were only 95 women at that institution, and nearly all of these foreigners. During the present term there are 162, the great majority of whom are in the philosophical department, theology and law having only two women students, and medicine one. Of these 162 women, 98 are Germans, 26 Americans, 23 Russians, 2 French, and one from Switzerland, Holland, Finland, Hungary, and Bulgaria. These women have organized a society, called "*Verein der studierenden Frauen Berlins*" (Association of the women students of Berlin), and meet for literary and social purposes once a month. The membership is 60.

Compared with Berlin the attendance of women at other German universities is small, Heidelberg and Breslau each number 30; Freiburg, in Baden, 28; Göttingen and Greifswald, each 20; Kiel, 22; Königsberg, 13; Bonn and Leipzig, each 12; Halle, 8; Rostock, 4; Erlangen, 4; Tübingen and Marburg, each 2. Jena, Giessen, and Strassburg do not admit women under any circumstances, not even as "hospitants." As Göttingen, Halle, Heidelberg and Leipzig admit students to the doctor examinations also in cases where no "testimony of maturity" from the gymnasium or preparatory school has been presented, these institutions can, by vote of Faculty, give a degree also to women, and this has been done in several instances.

One great difficulty in the way is the fact that the state makes no provisions for the preparation of women for entrance at the universities. There are no colleges or "Gymnasias", for women established or recognized by the state, and those women who would enter the universities must secure their preparation privately. There are indeed three schools, established in late years for the special purpose of offering girls courses leading up to the universities, these schools being found at Carlsruhe, Leipzig, and Berlin, but these institutions are not recognized by the state and their graduates must take their chances with other applicants. The attendance at these girls' colleges has been very small, and the oldest of these three schools, that at Carlsruhe, has virtually ceased to be an independent concern.

Some months ago Arthur Kirchhoff published a special volume on the subject, entitled "*Die akademische Frau*," in which he published the opinions of 122 prominent educators, literary men and others on the women question in connection with the universities. Of these 73 declared that women were just as capable of pursuing higher educational courses as men are, while 21 denied this, and 11 declined to give definite reply, and 17 replied in the affirmative conditionally.

IV. NEW INTERPRETATION OF JAMES 2, 14-26.

In the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, the organ of conservative theological research in Germany, No. 3 a. c., Pastor J. Böhmer publishes a novel interpretation of the old faith and works *crux* in the Epistle of St. James, which deserves to be noticed. His views are in substance these:

The common mistake in the many interpretations of this famous section is the failure to note sufficiently the significance of the λέγει τις with which it opens in v. 14. This evidently is intended to indicate that the word πιστις in the entire section from v. 14-26 is to be understood as though written in quotation marks. In v. 18 we again find a τις, and in v. 19 the first τις it seems, is addressed with the σύ. James himself has a fixed and settled conception of what Christian faith is, as appears from 1, 3, 6; 2, 5; 5, 15; but in 2, 14 sqq. he employs the word "faith," as

it is used by his opponents. Accordingly the following would be the run of thought: Someone claims that he has "faith," but has no works; and the question is, if such a "faith" can save him. That the faith here meant is understood in the way James conceives it, does not appear from these words, but James takes it in the sense in which his supposed adversary takes it, namely a faith without works, v. 14. Then follows an example to show how such a "faith" would work in concrete life, namely that as *ἐργον* can not proceed from it, vv. 15, 16. From this it is evident "faith," understood as is done by the adversary, i. e. without works is dead in itself. That which is dead is no more. If faith is dead, then, in reality, it is no faith at all and does not deserve this name. This construction is sustained by the *ἐάν* with the present subjunctive, v. 17. Blass, in his *N. T. Grammatik*, p. 200, says that *ἐάν* referred to a present certainty makes the condition indefinite. It is to be understood, that if faith has no works it is dead. James intentionally expresses himself in this indefinite way. Faith in itself has and must have works, is James' teaching; but others, namely his opponents, do not think so, but speak of a faith without works, and in their view alone he presupposes such a possibility. But if he had intended to say that the faith which *he* meant is a dead faith, then he would not have been permitted to say *ἐάν μὴ ἔτι*, but *εἰ* with the indicative (cf. Blass, *l. c.* p. 208,) or possibly *ὅτι*, *διότι* or the like.

Now a defender of James' own view appears and seeks to argue his opponent *ad absurdum*, v. 18. He says: You have faith, according to your own view; I, on the other hand, may not have faith as you understand it, but I have the works. We will examine what kind of a faith it is that you are speaking of, but at the same time will test it in this way: Show me an evidence of your faith without the works, which you cannot do, because you cannot demonstrate the presence of faith without also the works being present as the necessary results thereof; *your* faith, i. e. the thing you call faith, you may be able to show in this way, but a faith that *deserves* to be called so, you cannot. But I (*ἐγὼ* v. 18) will demonstrate from my works not *my* faith, but *the* faith that deserves this name in truth. For it is impossible to separate faith and works; for where there

are works, and only where there are works, faith can be demonstrated to be present.

But, continues James, the conception of faith with which you operate, O antagonist, is wrong. If what has been said does not satisfy you, listen to the following: v. 19, You "believe" that God is *one*? Is this all that is implied in your faith? That is a fine talk indeed (*καλῶς ποιεῖς*, an ironical exclamation,) for even demons "believe"; but what do they secure thereby? Not peace and blessedness; but they tremble. But what kind of a faith is that which causes believers to tremble? Accordingly know (v. 20) that faith understood as you do, is empty and "useless" and is worth nothing. A proof of this is the case of Abraham, v. 21. You must accede that he, so to say, was justified by faith in bringing his son Isaac to the altar. The writer here in his "so to say" assumes the attitude of his opponent, and wishes to say that a conception of faith as understood by the latter could not possibly be applied here. You must see (v. 22) that the faith which the Scriptures ascribe to Abraham made its appearance *in his works* and only through these works did his faith become "completed." But, v. 23, in this way is the Old Testament statement that Abraham *believed*, and this was counted to him for righteousness, fulfilled. Faith in the sense explained (v. 22) as τῶν ἔργων συνεργεῖ was a really and true faith deserving of that name. Accordingly you see, v. 24, that justification by no means is based on "faith" alone, i. e. understood as ye do, for such a faith is no faith, none of which it can be said that it was ἐτελειώθη. But from your standpoint, O ye opponents (v. 21), justification would take place on the ground of works. The same thing is the case of Rahab, v. 25, who too would be justified by works, and the only thing that could here be taken into consideration is this that she received the messenger.

But, continues the author, v. 25-26, this conception of the matter is entirely untenable, as they cannot be brought into harmony with the position of the opponents. They must ever take their refuge in works. And this is natural, for their "faith" is in reality no faith at all. For just as the body without the spirit is dead and is no body, thus faith without works is practically dead and is no "faith" at all.

V. THE POPE AND HIS INTERESTS IN ROME.

While Rome has been lost to the Pope, the eternal city has been made the centre and headquarters of a systematic agitation for restoration of the temporal power. This is done chiefly through the organization of special societies. Of these the chief is probably the *Circolo S. Michael*, organized in 1892, the avowed purpose being "to defend the church with all lawful and proper means," and to do so "in accordance with the principles and the directions of the Pope." Another association is the "*Commissione Reginale*," which aims at a unification and coöperation of the various Catholic congresses and committees in Italy that aim "at a defence of the papal chair." The same close connection with the interests of the Pope constitutes the program of the "*Circolo popolare di S. Lorenzo*," the tendencies of which is more popular seeking to arouse a general interest in the Vatican cause. Another society, the *Società di S. Paulo*, purposes particularly at enlisting the public press in this cause, and among other things also circulates a popular kind of Vatican literature and establishes five Catholic libraries. The "*Unione Anti-Massonica*" is only too well known from its connection with the Diana Vaughn "Devil" revelations of recent months, and aims particularly to defend the Pope against the machinations of the Free Masons. The characteristic feature of the "*Circolo di apologetica e storia pontificia*" is the defence of the Pope from the attacks of history. The modern Catacomb researches have called forth the *Società dei cultori dei martiri*, the society of those who revere the martyrs, but practically an organization in the interest of the retention of the temporal power. In order to unite all of these and other similar societies in the one object and aim there exists the so-called Pius Confederation, the "*Federazione Piana delle Società cattoliche in Roma*," the present president of which is Prince Massimo. Not to be forgotten in this connection, as working in the same direction are the numberless theological institutions in Rome, the national academies and others, of which the one alone, the *Collegium Romanum*, the real Papal college, alone numbers 1,000 students. Then too there are 39 male and 107 female religious orders represented in the holy city all with

one heart and mind working for a revival of the status before 1870.

The Prisoner in the Vatican is however well protected. His army consists of five "Corps", namely the Guard of Nobles, the Swiss Guards, the Palace Guards, the Police Guards and the Firemen (Pompieri). The Guard of Nobles, under the command of Prince Altieri, consists of about fifty young men of the clerical aristocracy, who receive a monthly stipend of 300 to 400 lire, and in addition can expect several thousand lire when they bring the official notice of election to a newly selected cardinal. This body of soldiers has its own elegant casino, allotted to them after it had been forbidden them to visit the "Hunter's Club," of which King Humbert is the Honorary President. The Swiss Guard consists of about one hundred able-bodied Swiss young men, who stand guard at the entrance of the Vatican and wear the uniform originally designed for them by Michael Angelo. The Palace Guards consists of two companies recruited from the Catholic societies of Rome. They receive a fixed sum annually to pay for their uniforms, and their services are required on certain festival occasions. Their barracks are found in the Courts of San Damaso, and their commandant at present is General Catarosa. The Police Guards consists of one hundred men, commanded by Captain Tagliaferri, and these men are all former Italian soldiers who have, one and all, received the testimonial from their bishops that they are good Catholics and trustworthy in every particular. The Pompieri number thirty men and are under the direction of a Marshal. This whole Papal army has a military journal of its own called "*La Fedelta Catholica*", in which all matters of interest pertaining to the army are published.

VI. ZIONISM A CENTURY AGO.

In these days when special efforts are put forth systematically to colonize the Jews in various lands and when Zionism looking to the reestablishment of the Jewish state in the lands of their fathers has become a fixed fact and program in the ambitions of a large section of the Jews themselves, it is interesting to hear of a similar attempt made

less than a century ago by a prominent American Jew who tried to establish an organized state of his own people here in America. The person in question was Noah Mordechai and in his day the plan aroused a good deal of excitement among his coreligionists. Information on the scheme is rather difficult to secure, as the original documents were all published in Hebrew. In the *Annual of Hungarian-Jewish Literature* for 1898, Dr. M. Kayserling, of Budapest, publishes a long account of the agitation, and the *Krankard* Hebrew weekly "*Ha-maggid*" publishes the same in Hebrew, while an abbreviated translation in German appears in the *Nathanael*, of Berlin, published by Professor Strack, No. 4. The leading facts in the case are the following:

Noah Mordechai was the first man who in the beginning of this century formed the plan of buying a large tract of land upon which to colonize the Jews. Mordechai was a member of a prominent Jewish family of Portugal, which in consequence of persecution had fled to America by way of London. He was born in Philadelphia in 1783. His father being a traveling merchant could not devote much time or attention to the education of his son, and the boy was accordingly left in charge of his grandfather. From early youth he became interested in art, especially sculpturing, and became an apprentice in this work. He also at a very early age began to write for the stage, but was not very successful. In 1810 he went to Charleston, S. C., and became the editor of a political paper. During all this time he was busy at work studying Jewish literature, and in addition again began to write dramas. One of these, called "The Watch on the Rhine," was produced in New York when the author was only twenty-four years of age.

Mordechai was a great lover of his people and a warm adherent of the faith of Israel. For a long time he was filled with the desire of visiting his coreligionists in Southern Africa, to study their condition and manners, which had not been done by an educated Israelite since Benjamin of Tudela (1165-1173). He applied for the position of United States Consul in Tunis and Tripolis, and was appointed by President Madison, intending to enter upon the duties of his office in 1813. On his way, however, his vessel was captured by the British, and he was taken to England. La-

ter he went to Tunis and as consul managed to do some good work, especially in securing the release of American prisoners. Later he returned to New York, establishing the periodical called "National Advocate." In 1822 he was elected sheriff of New York City, and took a warm interest in Jewish affairs in that metropolis. Mordechai was a firm believer in the predictions of the prophets that Israel should again be established as an independent nation.

This idea had filled his heart from earliest youth. In 1825 he tried to realize his ideal in actual fact. With the assistance of his family and friends he bought "Grand Island", near New York, thirteen miles long and five wide, and it was here that he determined to gather his people, and in conjunction with the Indians, whom he regarded as the remnants of the Lost Ten Tribes, to start on an expedition that would result in the conquest of Palestine. He published an Appeal to the Jews of the Earth, in which he invited them to come to his place of rendezvous. He appointed as aids and assistants in this project (although without their knowledge or consent) the Rabbis of Paris, and of London, and several influential Jews in Italy, Spain and Germany. The island he had acquired he called "Ararat."

In the year 1825, in the city of Buffalo, on the Jewish New Year, a mass convention of the adherents of Mordechai was held, on which occasion too a beginning was to be made with the establishment of the colony Ararat. In the centre of the city a large flag with Jewish inscriptions was unfolded. The processions were headed by singers and players, societies and organizations of various kinds took part, followed by Mordechai, in rich raiment, "the judge and ruler of Israel," as he called himself. The procession unfolded. The procession was headed by singers and marched in solemn tread to one of the churches of the city, upon the altar of which was a stone, intended to be the corner-stone of the new city Ararat, bearing the inscription found in Deut. 6, 4. After reading the prophetic passages speaking of the reestablishment of Israel as a state, Mordechai ascended the pulpit and gave an account of the contemplated project. This singular ceremony was the beginning and the end of the Jewish state Ararat. Conservative Jews heard of Mordechai's scheme with forebodings. The

Rabbis of Europe protested in a determined way against the plan and everywhere throughout Jewish circles warnings against this Utopia was heard. The whole plan turned out to be a dismal failure. Mordechai alone remained faithful to his scheme and twenty years later tried to revive it. From 1842 to the end of his life in 1850, he was leader of a Jewish charitable society in New York. All praised his zeal and devotion, but none could share his dreams of Israel's reestablishment state.

VII. A STUNDIST SERVICE.

Even the representatives of the Orthodox Church, who have all along been decrying the Stundists as a danger to the state and society, are beginning to do tardy justice to the deeper religious character of these persecuted non-conformists of Russia. A leading Moscow paper recently contained a description of a Stundist meeting reported by a writer strongly antagonistic to the teachings of this people. Yet he is compelled to report only good things of them. His description is substantially the following:

The meeting was held in a rather small room belonging to a Lutheran manufacturer. There were no saint's images in the place, but there was a piano. On the table lay several dozen books, and among them New Testaments and copies of Stundish hymn books. On the wall hung several mottos, Ps. 119, 18 and Col. 3, 23. The meeting was attended by about twenty persons. The services were opened by singing a hymn with piano accompaniment. This was followed by a short address by the chairman, in which he pointed out the fact that they had met under guidance of the Holy Spirit and at the promptings of their own hearts, and he admonished his hearers to be thankful to God. After the entire assembly had knelt in prayer, the chairman prayed extemporaneously, praising God that he had saved mankind through His blood, and had given them life, reason and the power to become better creatures. This prayer was followed by prayers of others, in which the petition for a clearer insight into the Word of God and for love to each

other were very prominent. When no more announced their wish to pray, the chairman asked that any one who felt moved to do so should read a section of the Gospel and give an expression of their thoughts on the portion read. The first one to announce himself was a peasant, who read Luke 5, 36 sqq., and in connection with this admonished those present not to be content with merely having overcome this or that particular evil, but that it was necessary to become an entirely new creature, which could be accomplished only through love for our neighbors and for the enemies. In commenting on a decree published in a recent issue of a Moscow journal forbidding the collection of money for the benefit of certain religious non-conformists, the speaker declared that this very publication was a proof that the persons issuing it were not living in accordance with the gospel. A second participant read 1 John 4, 8 sqq. which he explained as a command that our whole hearts should be filled with love and a desire to please God; mere outward piety and so-called good works would not be sufficient to merit the kingdom of God. The chairman expressed his particular thanks to the last mentioned for his sentiments and emphasized the deep truths expressed. Then all again knelt in prayer, the chairman spoke an extempore prayer of thanksgiving, another repeated the Lord's Prayer, a third followed with another free prayer, and with a hymn of mutual love the service closed.

Notwithstanding this good report the "orthodox" writer feels himself called upon to warn against the "crooked ways" and "deceptive tricks" of the Stundists, who seek to "destroy the people," and have ventured to extend their propaganda to the very gates of the sacred city of Moscow. Just what the Russian State and Church think of the Stundists can be seen from the fact that lately in Odessa two peasants were condemned to imprisonment for one year and four months because they had been trying (but had not succeeded) to convert two other peasants to the doctrine of the Stundists.

A MIRROR FOR PASTORS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF GUTHE BY REV. W. E.
TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

THE ACTIVITY OF THE PASTOR.**§ 54. THE DUTY OF PASTORAL CARE.**

"Homiletical expertness and catechetical skill signify much, but are not a discharge of the heaviest obligation." The most difficult work is pastoral care. The Apostle Paul said of himself that he preached and taught publicly (*δημοσίᾳ*) and from house to house (*κατ' οἴκους*), that he warned every one (*ἐνα ἑκαστον*), Acts 20, 20. 31. This is recorded as a precept and an example for every minister of Christ. Pastoral care is thereby made the duty of each one; no one has a right to dispense himself therefrom. But it is, alas! an old complaint, that many ministers limit their office to the church and the school, and neglect their calling in the homes. The well-known Rostock preacher Grossgebauer, who has complained of this with special earnestness in his "Wächterstimme aus dem verwüsteten Zion," calls those ministers who forget their pastoral office and only preach "Allein-Prediger" (preachers only). "The Allein-Prediger is for the most part sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal, although he speaks with the tongues of men and of angels.—The Allein-Prediger preaches a great deal and convinces the people, that where there is much preaching, there the exhortation of Paul is fulfilled: let the word dwell among you richly!—The Allein-Prediger preaches elegant sermons for the sake of glory and when he has preached he says, that he has now done his work. But the householder believes that the management of the house is his proper work, and when he has preached, he says that he has done only half of the work.—A pastor preaches, but he is not an Allein-Prediger. He is indeed more. He is a governor of the congregation. He pays attention to the spiritual growth of each one. A shepherd does not give the same kind of food to all the sheep.—A pastor notices how each of the lambs in particular improves under the preached Word, and if he discovers that no fruits follow, he seeks after the cause."

With the evangelical ardour of an Elias, Mengerling, the earnest preacher of righteousness of his time, hurls into the conscience of ministers the question: "Art thou free from the blood of all thy hearers, in such way that thou hast withheld from none of them the counsel of God, that thou hast particularly looked after the humblest person under thy care, and hast been concerned earnestly about that person's repentance, conversion and salvation?" And then he continues: "Would that this question could be printed in red cinnabar. Yea, I would that it were inscribed with letters of gold in every study-room and room of prayer; yea, that they might be engraved with iron styles and sharp-pointed diamonds on the tablets of the hearts of all pastors and ministers, that such a question and such appeals to the conscience might never be lost from their eyes, their minds, their hearts and thoughts.

§55. NECESSITY OF KNOWING THE CONGREGATION AND KNOWING MEN.

The Chief Shepherd says, John 10, 14: "I know my sheep." And he who would be an assistant shepherd, must take time to learn to know the sheep of his flock. It is also of great value to possess an exact knowledge of the external and internal history of the place.

It is, however, not enough that the minister know the individual members of the congregation outwardly by name, he must take the time to observe their individuality. The study of psychology is extremely important for the pastor. Whoever is not a psychologist, cannot be a true psychagog (one who engages in the work and the leading of souls). For the study of psychology the dramatic poets, especially Shakespeare, are very rich. The pious Monnard has said that a good preacher must have on the right side of his study-table the Bible, on the left, Shakespeare.

§56. KINDNESS TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE CONGREGATION.

"Soul for soul!" was the saying of the faithful Sriver. It was said of Zinzendorf that his care in the guidance of souls embraced each and every person in the congregation,

not excepting the children. That was acting according to the pastoral rule 2 Tim. 2, 24: "the servant of the Lord must be gentle unto all men." Two things are said there: 1) the servant of the Lord should not devote himself solely to *certain* members of the congregation, but to *all*; 2) he should be *gentle* towards *all*. How much mischief would be prevented if each pastor acted according to this rule! A right kind of pastor takes the same position with respect to the members of his congregation that wise and loving parents occupy toward their children. "Parents should regard all their children with the same love and favor. One should be as dear to them as the other. If it were demanded of a mother to deliver up one of her children, the true mother-heart would not be able to resolve to indicate this one or that one. If it were said: God requires one of thee, a true mother would say: the Lord may take whichever He desires. When Christian parents are grieved by one of their children, they should still bear that child in their hearts. Through equal love to all should they bind each to themselves. Against the enemy that would estrange a child from its parents, and cause the children to fall out with one another, the door must be held shut, that he may not enter into the family. The favor shown must be equal toward all; but not so with the satisfaction we derive from each. It is impossible to have the same pleasure in children who conduct themselves differently. It is not wrong to look with particular pleasure upon an especially dutiful child. But it is dangerous if one permits this pleasure to become noticeable, as Israel did. This does not correspond with the wisdom which is from above, for by such conduct one gives occasion for pride and envy.—As in a family, so also in a congregation. A servant of the Lord who has to watch over a congregation, should embrace all entrusted to him with equal love. Even those who occasion us care and worry must we bear upon our hearts and not permit them to become estranged from us. A servant of Christ dare have no favorites, as the apostle writes to his beloved son Timothy: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality." 1 Tim. 5, 21. We must not let ourselves be

governed in the judging and treatment of members in the congregation by human aversion or affection. Of course he who presides over a congregation will have more pleasure and joy in some than in others, but we should be warned against unwisely exhibiting these feelings, by the example of the patriarch Jacob and the sad result of his conduct. The head of a congregation should not belong to some, but to all. His activity should be devoted to the welfare of the whole congregation, and advantage of all just as much as possible. He dare not gather around him a small circle of favorites, to whom he devotes himself in a peculiar way. He dare not build a little church within the church."

The pastor must especially observe the "friendly to all" toward those who are estranged from the church and are filled with all sorts of prejudices against the truth of the Gospel. Especially in our time—says a man who knows life—must one have compassion with and judge mildly those who hold themselves aloof from the Gospel. For seldom has it been more difficult than in our century, for a man who stands right in the midst of the press of life, to find his way through the labyrinths of doubts and struggles, in which most people are nowadays entangled. Proudly and solemnly do the spokesmen of our age stalk past ancient Christianity: "It has grown obsolete, it is cast off, it has no longer any signification for our time!" The majority of the representatives of the otherwise separated and different sciences have entered into a confederacy to prove that the old faith of the Bible is a weakly confiding faith, which must be given over to the simpletons and the uncultured. The most popular books, the most widely circulated journals, in short the most of that which our generation receives as spiritual nourishment, breathes this spirit. And so it is not to be wondered at much that the higher institutions of culture are governed by this spirit which is alienated from the positive, historical Christianity. It is clear that most fathers, mothers and other educators can inspire no other spirit than that which circulates in their own lives. On the other hand in some "Christian families" such a legal, overdone, super-spiritual Christianity is forced on the children, that it is not surprising if, in time, the most violent reaction and the bitterest opposition result. O, for him who in his

youth has not had the happiness to see and to experience the life-power and the blessing which lie in a truly Christian life; it is to-day made hard indeed to come to faith! For the present world-spirit, which encircles most men from their youth up, is bitterly hostile to Christianity. One cannot easily withdraw himself from this spirit; it is the atmosphere we breathe. The hearts of countless men are from early years interwoven and surrounded with mere prejudices against Christianity and there they sit like flies which have been caught in the spider's web. Truly, many children of our day know nothing of the truth excepting the doubts and objections that are made to it, they know nothing of Christianity excepting its caricatures!

We owe mildness and friendliness to those also who are open opponents of Christian truth. Dare the servant of Christ, who is called to go after the lost sheep until he finds it, stand inferior to an Antigone, who has spoken the beautiful word: "I do not join in hating, but in loving"? It is said of K. Heinrich Rieger, that each time when he prepared to go out into the congregation to discharge pastoral duties, while drawing on his coat, he would address to himself the words of Paul, Col. 3, 12: "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering!" Thence we understand how the man worked with such rich blessing. Love is the law of gravitation in the world of humanity. The pastor cannot think of this often enough.

§57. PASTORAL WISDOM.

A true pastor carefully observes the opportunities when he can reach the hearts of the individual members of the congregation. Such opportunities are afforded by agreeable and by earnest visitations, by domestic joys and sorrows. Let the pastor guard himself against making and forcing opportunities and learn to wait in patience the right moment, when he can produce from the treasure of God's Word the suitable word, in order to sink it into the heart.

Among the afflicted, the weary and the heavy-laden, among the poor, the sick and the mourning the Word of

God has ever found the most accessible hearts and has made the greatest conquests. Upon these the pastor has to-day yet to direct his attention especially. In his visits to the homes let him not begin immediately to preach, let him beware of that false piety, which commands or decries the natural feeling of suffering into silence, let him show first of all that he has a gentle, compassionate heart.

O, if all ministers were so filled with hearty love to the poor as were Ambrose, Chrysostom, Luther, Francke, Oberlin, Jänicke, Deuner—a great part of the poor would then not be so estranged from the church and would not be so easily affected by the teachings of the apostles of materialism. Is the soul of the poor buried under the mound of concern about the daily bread, then that mound must first be removed; otherwise the Word that offers the heavenly manna will find no entrance into the soul. Paul was the great preacher of the Gospel, but we meet him more than once as the gatherer and bearer of collections, and this was no deviation from his calling. The minister should learn from Paul to be the advocate of the poor in the poor board, among the wealthy private citizens, and the bearer of the charitable gifts.—Let the minister never indulge himself in harsh, rough language toward the poor, not even toward those who have incurred their own misery. Boerhave could be moved even to tears by the sight of a fallen man: he thought that also he through the natural sinfulness of his heart might have sunk into the same corruption if the grace of God had not continually upheld him. If the physician of the soul is filled with the same humble disposition, he will proceed gently even with those people whose poverty is self-incurred. T. Beck, in one of his discourses, gives a very valuable hint how one should speak with and act towards the poor, when he addresses the poor in the words: You poor in particular,—I will indeed not speak harshly to you, for you have at present enough hard words and blows—but the son, who began to be in want and to fall continually into deeper want, reminds you so vividly of your own condition: whether you, as he, have in part brought yourselves into misery or not, cease your murmuring and despairing and leave off remonstrating with God and your

fellow men; go into yourselves in your need and search into your heart and life, think that you have a Father, of whom you are not worthy, who, however, has mercy upon all His works, and is rich toward all, towards those who call upon Him, who call upon Him earnestly, who receives with joy all those who come to Him penitently and humbly and provides for them sufficiently: resolve and carry into execution: I will arise and go unto my Father.

As the poor, so also the sick discover instinctively whether the minister has a heart for them or not. Whoever lacks this heart may speak to the sick ever so many and ever so beautiful words about patience, trust in God, God's help—his words do not penetrate, they run off the sick as water runs off oil-skin. The mere external, mechanical officiating is discharged nowhere more than in the sick-chamber. He who brings love, brings much. If a minister can, during the first few visits, express only his hearty sympathy, they will not have been in vain: the hearty sympathy of the pastor unlocks the heart of the sick and makes it willing to receive comfort and admonition from God's Word.

§58. CONFIDENCE.

Real sympathy in the joy and the sorrow of the members of the congregations helps to awaken confidence in the physician of the soul, which is at least as necessary to him as to the physician of the body. That confidence is preserved and strengthened, if the congregation receives the impression of its pastor that he daily remembers, 1 Cor. 9, 27, that care for his own soul is his first care. "Men desire of a pastor that he be exacting with himself, and no comfort comforts from the mouth of a man who takes everything lightly." John Wesley was so strict with himself, that he did not allow himself the slightest levity. Go thou and do likewise! The most striking sermon is that which appears through the life, and this is the best means for gaining and preserving the confidence of the congregation.

WORKING THROUGH THE CONDUCT.

§ 59. THE LIFE—A SERMON.

The nobler among the ancient heathen demanded of their public speakers that they be moral persons. Solon forbade that a coward, a voluptuary or a spendthrift should deliver a public discourse. According to Quintilain the orator should be an upright man (*vir bonus*). Seneca remarks, that none deserve worse of men than those who live one way and command to live another. It is a long journey by the way of precept, a short and effectual by the way of example. And in another place he expresses the verdict: Thou wilt give much, though thou wilt have given nothing beyond example. The most striking apology of the truth of the Gospel was the holy life of the first Christians. A Tertullian confesses in his *Apologeticus*, that the holy life of the Christians made the first deep impression on his heart and gave the first impulse to his conversion. "Our age has an active taste for the actual, it demands realities and not only beautiful words or beautiful theories. That is the demand which it makes of Christians, to exhibit their faith as a reality. The minister in particular should give heed to this. As his sermon should be life, so his life should be a sermon. Of what benefit are the most beautiful sermons of the minister, if his life stands in dissonance with them!

Predigt so einer das Beste, so sagen doch endlich die Laien: Spricht er das Gute und thut er das Böse, was soll man erwählen?

Concerning a preacher who shuns what he ought to do, and does what he ought to shun, the congregation makes the same sarcastic remarks, that the Roman people made about that philosopher, who wrote an eloquent apology of poverty, and had tons of gold heaped up which he anxiously guarded in a vault.

According to a decree of the council held at Carthage, 398, the cantor, at his induction into office, was to be earnestly reminded thus: See that what thou singest with the mouth, thou believest with the heart and what thou believest with the heart thou dost verify by thy deeds. That

word is for the preacher also. A life conformed to God's Word is, as the ancients said, the most beautiful exordium to the minister's sermon and for all truth-seeking souls the best way to their good will. Rather an oratorically imperfect sermon with this most beautiful exordium than a sermon oratorically perfect but lacking that exordium.

It is much better, says Jerome, to possess holy plainness than wicked eloquence.

All men of God insist rightly on the sermon by means of the life, on personal Christianity. Let a few at least speak.

Cyprian: It avails nothing to praise virtue with our words and destroy the truth by our deeds.

Ambrose: We not only lie by false words, but by false deeds; it is a lie to call one's self a Christian and not to do Christ's works.

Os, lingua, mens, sensus, vigor
Confessionem personet.

(Let mouth, tongue, mind, reason, strength echo our confession.)

Lactantius: Men prefer examples to words; because it is easy to talk, it is more difficult to execute. Would that as many did well as speak well. But they who teach, do not; they are wanting in faith.

Augustine says: If the members of the congregation see that the conduct of the church's servant does not harmonize with his doctrine, the inevitable result is that they do not willingly hear him, who does not hear himself and God's Word, and they condemn both what is preached to them and the preacher.

Jerome: He ruins the authority of teaching by whose work the sermon is destroyed.—Mouth, mind and hand of the priest should be agreed.

Hilary of Poitiers: It is best to teach by examples before one tries it with words.

Chrysostom: The teacher must first teach himself. For as a general cannot be a general unless he has previously been the best soldier, so also the teacher. With faith and a good conscience shouldst thou stand before the others.—Through right teaching and right living thou in-

structest the people how to live; through right teaching and bad living thou instructest God how to damn thee.

Gregory of Nazianzen: One must first be cleansed and thereafter cleanse others, first be instructed and thereafter instruct others, first become light and thereafter enlighten others, first draw near to God and thereafter point others to him.

Gregory the Great: If thou neglectest to fulfill that which thou teachest, thou preparest a harvest for others but carriest no grain into thy own garner.—That voice penetrates the hearts more easily which the speaker's life commends.—The seed of the word germinates easily when the preacher's piety moistens it in the hearer's breast.

Isidor: It is necessary to shine both by word and by deed.

Theophylact: First the work, then the sermon. No teacher's sermon is substantial except the teacher first show himself a doer.

Bernhard of Clairvaux: The voice of one's work is stronger than that of the mouth.

Luther: That is not being a theologian when one knows great things and teaches many things, but when one lives holily and theologically.

Calvin: Doctrine will avail little, if uprightness and holiness do not appear.

Spener: A preacher must know that his life is a part of his office.

Rupert Melden: Whoever wants to build the church, must be a salt, which salting power by no means lies merely in the purity of the doctrine, but also in the purity of the life. . . . It is undeniable that the Holy Ghost does not dwell in unclean vessels, and he who leads himself wrong, cannot lead others right.

Massillon: For countless people in the world the priest's life, of which they are witnesses, is their whole Gospel. . . . The people of the world regard our life as the reality and the true extract (of Christianity), to which one must hold.

Vinet: The pastor is in the world's eyes the representative of Christian ideas and the vast multitude judges

Christianity by him. This will, perhaps, not excuse those who judge, if they judge falsely, but it arraigns us.

Löhe: Woe to him who is so negligent as to preach the divine Word to the flock of Christ without sealing it by his example, perhaps by his evil example hinders it. An evil example is truly not only a human, but a satanic hindrance to the Word. The crowd cries with a thousand tongues: the life of the clergy the people's Gospel; the multitude has a wicked eye, it leaves scarcely one pure example uncriticised, it catches at the preacher's every fault, if it be only to take offence, to quiet its own conscience, to excuse its own sin. It cannot therefore be deeply enough impressed on the servant of the Gospel, how responsible he is if he leads a life that is contradictory to the Word which he preaches.

C. M. Nitzsch: The most attractive prologue and the most appropriate epilogue of the sermon are and will remain the person, life and walk of the preacher. Not as though the Word of God in its purity and truth did not surpass the works of the instrument, but it is a question whether the Word does not draw to itself thorns in the mouth corrupted by heart and life and receives additions which do not proceed from the Lord. The very worst thing that can happen to a congregation and its office, is the fiery, seemingly ascetic, deeply prayerful zeal of a preacher, who has carried many to repentance, who has shown at last the goat's foot, or from whom the mask will some time fall off, because a bad tree brings forth bad fruit.

Palmer: The moral demands which concern all, are made of him in a higher degree as the representative of all spiritual life in the congregation; the congregation desires to behold personified in its minister the inward turning away from the world, the freedom from the service of the corruptible, the earnestness as well as the calm of the Christian life. All that which it recognizes as its mark over against the world estranged from God, and this not merely in certain acts, as if he had indeed the office, whilst in his leisure hours he could be and do what he pleased, but that representative character should distinctly stamp itself in his person and therefore in his position as minister, and also

in his social life, thus forming a complete and harmonious whole.

Sailer: The life of the minister should be blameless, that is, not only clean from every offence and from gross crimes, but free from the suspicion that he might have committed some of these things. This blamelessness before men should be accompanied by the untiring struggle to be blameless also before the scrutiny of the conscience and before the eye of God. Blamelessness has three degrees: 1) To be blameless before the eyes of men, who do not see the heart; 2) To be blameless before the eye of the conscience, which judges the heart; 3) To be blameless before the eye of God, who sees also the blemishes, which can not be so easily noticed by the most exact conscience. The most beautiful praise a bishop could receive would be this: he lived blameless—before his people, his conscience, his God.

Wesselmann: If the faults of other men are likened to the faults of a watch, it has been correctly said, then the preacher's faults are like those of the town-clock; they disturb the whole congregation.—As the sermon is outwardly preceded by a hymn, which urges to collection and preparation, and is followed by a hymn which admonishes to preservation and practice of the word, so inwardly the truth of faith, from which the sermon springs, must precede, and the truth of a holy life must follow, by which the sermon's power as productive of fruit is tested. The preacher's faith is the introductory hymn to his sermon and his pious life the concluding hymn to the same.

The Rostock theologian, P. Tarnov, compares the preacher, who has his theology in the head and on the tongue, but not in his heart and life, to a "useless smith, who talks about the hammer but cannot beat the iron with it" and to a "useless carpenter, who delivers a dissertation on the ax but cannot hew wood with it."

How practically Melancthon pursued his theology! He could give this testimony of himself: I am conscious in myself of having studied theology for no other reason than that I might amend my life. Eusebius records of Origen: As his word, so was his life. The epitaph of Basil the Great reads: Thou art the only one that didst conform

life to doctrine and doctrine to life. Thy teaching was like the thunder and thy life like the lightning. The lightning is seen, the thunder is heard.

When in Athens the Seven against Thebes was produced and in that connection the verses were recited which described the princely seer Amphiaraus:

"For he would not appear, but be, the bravest!"

the whole multitude looked toward Aristides, who was present, because these words most suitably applied to him. So every congregation, when in the pastoral letters the picture of a genuine servant of Christ is presented, should think of its pastor and be able to testify of him: he is what he should be, "blameless, as the steward of God" (Tit. 1, 7), "an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity" (1 Tim. 4, 12). Happy the preacher of whom men can say: his most beautiful sermon is his life!

Who then will prove a praiseworthy theologian?

He who teaches what things should be done and does what things should be taught.

NOTES.

PROBABLY the most valuable publication of general interest to Bible students that has been issued for many months in the department of New Testament textual investigation is the "*Novum Testamentum Graeco cum apparatu critico ex editionibus et libris manu-scriptis collecto*," 1898, by the well known New Testament and Syriac specialist, Professor Edward Nestle, of Ulm. The work contains all the variants of the leading editions of the New Testament. It is published by the Württemberg Bible Society, and although a volume of 660 octavo pages with five charts, it can be bought bound for 1.80 marks, or about 45 cents. The object which the Bible Society had in view was to offer at the lowest price possible a thoroughly reliable and critically satisfactory text to the general Bible student and thus crowd, if possible, the old, unreliable "*textus receptus*" with which the continent is still flooded. Nestle's edition

really offers everything which the student of the New Testament text, unless he would do the work of a specialist, needs. It can be especially recommended to pastors and students. This Greek text is issued in various forms and bindings, the most expensive being 3.50 marks. The Württemberg Bible Society also publishes this edition in connection with the Luther translation, based on the last edition of the German text, 1545. The two together cost, bound, \$2.50, and the German can be had alone at prices ranging from 60 pfennigs to 2.50 marks. These editions deserve a wide circulation.

THE careful observer of the ups and downs of theological interests in Germany will not have failed to notice the remarkable interest which is now developing in the field of dogmatical and systematic research in general. To a certain extent no doubt the rather phenomenal growth of the Ritschl school, the peculiar teachings and tenets of which are dogmatical and ethical to the core, will explain this phenomenon. But in general it can be said that the purely Biblical criticism, which for several decades practically monopolized the attention of the theological world in the Fatherland, no longer occupies this prominence. The revived interest in dogmas and doctrines appears in two ways, in the publication of larger treatises in this department, representing both the liberal and the conservative school, the best work of the latter type being probably the new volume of Luthardt, and in lengthy dogmatical discussions in theological journals. Thus the "*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*," the scientific organ of the Ritschl school, almost confines itself to dogmatical discussions, the last number, e. g., volume 8, heft 5, containing only Herzog's discussions on Sören Kierkegaard (the great Danish systematic theologian); Sells on State Church and Free Church, and Gottschick (the editor) on Luther's doctrine on the Communion of the believer with his God. In conservative journals the same tendency is observed. In the "*Theol. Litteraturblatt*," of Leipzig, e. g. No. 42, no less than ten solid columns by Professor Schmidt, of Breslau, are devoted to an announcement of so special a work as Kähler's discussion of the doctrine of Atonement.